DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 104 186 HE 006 292

AUTHOR Engen, Timothy Ray; Crippen, Daniel L.
TITLE A Report Presented to: National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Coll. of Education.; National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, Washington, D.C.; National Student Educational Fund, Washington, D.C.; Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, Lincoln, Nebr. Student Committee.
PUB DATE Nov 73
NOTE 110p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$5.70 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; *Educational Finance; Employment Opportunities; Employment Potential; Financial Support; *Higher Education; Internship Programs; Research Projects; Statistical Data; *Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; *Student Loan Programs
IDENTIFIERS National Commission Financing Postsecondary Educ

ABSTRACT

This survey, developed with the underlying philosophy of uncovering basic attitudes of students, reached approximately 11,000 students representing diverse interests, ages, programs, geographic locales, and socioeconomic backgrounds from 188 institutions. Of these 11,000 students, approximately 25 percent responded to the survey instrument and another 3 percent participated in the 15 regional interviews. Statistical data are presented for student characteristics, need for and desirability of field of study, employability of curriculum by field of study, effectiveness of internship programs, efficiency and effectiveness of resources, student responsibility, student aid, desirability of opportunity by level of educational attainment, adequacy of secondary education, adequacy of present resources, appropriateness of parental support, appropriate primary support, satisfaction by institutional type, and desirability of student loans. Various other areas are covered in addition to a summarization of observations concerning student attitudes, educational purposes, and national objectives. (MJM)

ED104186

A REPORT

Presented to:

NATIONAL COMMISSION on the FINANCING of POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Timothy Ray Engen,
Commissioner

Daniel L. Crippen,
Student,
University of
South Dakota

November 1973

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Reproduced with minor revisions by the College of Education at Michigan State University in cooperation with the Information Gap Project of the National Student Educational Fund in Washington, D. C., and the Student Committee of the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

January 1975

INTRODUCTION-INTENTION

On May 15, 1973, the Review of Student Response was proposed to the Executive Director and the Executive Committee of the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education compliant with Part II, Section C, Subsection 1 of the approved Communications Plan.

> II. Commissioners and staff will interact with large numbers of key leaders and organizations and groups under the following guidelines.
>
> C. Commissioners and/or staff, upon request, will meet with organizations and groups to discuss the general work of the Commission and specific phases of Commission activity and will maintain communication lines with designated organizations or appropriate bodies.
>
> 1. If Commissioners have not been assigned specific responsibility in an area, Commissioners should clear activities, as outlined above, with the Executive Committee if expenditures of Commission funding is to be involved.

On June 5, 1973, the Executive Committee approved the research project subject to the supervision of the Commission's Chairman and Executive Director and subject to the authorized budget. (See Tab I–page 1)

From August to November, 1973, the project proceeded with the purposes originally drafted in May. Communication with the approximate 11 million students in American postsecondary education was the salient concern. The project was thus designed to foward the following intentions:

1. To identify, clarify, and transmit the student perspective regarding postsecondary education to the Commission.

2. To inform the student constituency of the role and charge of the Commission.

3. To subject completed Commission efforts to intense student scrutiny.

4. To allow students the unusual privilege of providing direct input into national educational policy making.

In order to satisfy the broadly-based intentions as well as produce a document that could be of considerable usefulness to the Commission, a host of alternative actions were considered. It would be necessary to communicate to a large number of educational consumers and understand their definitive responses to issues. It would also be necessary to grasp the students' feeling, "gut reactions" and logic before the understanding of any nationally distributed survey could be of value and could be interpreted correctly. Furthermore, although the data on student reactions to postsecondary education financing are minimal, it is important that some effort be made to map existing data against available current responses.

Thus, to satisfy these intentions and complete the Review of Student Response, four distinct projects were included:

1. To conduct a national survey that would evaluate student response to educational issues and Commission objectives, and would evaluate student willingness and ability to respond to the topic of educational finance.

2. To organize regional input sessions across the country to hear first-hand student responses to the Commission effort to date as well as encourage and record free responses to questions on all aspects of postsecondary education (PSE).

3. To review and correlate previous student-related studies, articles and philosophies to the aforementioned projects.

4. To compile, illustrate, and correlate the national survey and literature search into a document that could be of use to the Commission.

At this writing, even amidst constraints of time and finances, these projects have been satisfactorily completed. As of November 1, 1973, the Review of Student Response has reached approximately 11,000 students representing diverse interests, ages, programs, geographic locales and socioeconomic backgrounds from 188 institutions (private, public and proprietary). Of these numbers, approximately 25 per cent of the students responded to the survey instrument and another 300 participated in the 15 regional review sessions.

These high percentage rates of responses and participation should be particularly encouraging. The students not only responded in great numbers but also with great interest and concern. Two particular observations should not go unnoticed here. Students can respond intelligently to even the most complex educational issues and tradeoffs if they are afforded the opportunity. Students have a sincere desire to participate in national policy making, and their intent is to be constructive in their participation.

The report admittedly and understandably has some significant limitations. As the literature search demonstrated, there is not a wealth of information available on student responses to or the needs and desires of PSE finance. In this sense, the study is a pioneering effort. Even though the high response is encouraging, the Review should be considered in the limited context for which it was designed with respect to the entire postsecondary enterprise. In light of these limitations, it is strongly suggested that new efforts commence to fill the apparent data inadequacy if students are going to be consulted in the future.

A second obvious caveat is one of time and resources. The information presented here by no means represents all the information that was produced. More data, particularly from the survey and review sessions, are available on request; but the report as presented here is as conclusive as time and money permitted. We could not display even significant survey responses for these reasons.

A third limitation is one of presentation. This study is obviously not enriched with a technical orientation nor is it developed as a complete dissertation. It is presented here as the students responded. The survey represents 2,300 "gut reactions." However, with more exposure and opportunity to respond coupled with the willingness of those in high places to continue to include students in the decision-making process, the technical orientation and literary sophistication would be possible.

In addition, the report was designed amidst considerable confusion as to the best means of

presentation for the report's usefulness to the Commission effort as of November, 1973. Although the emphasis upon purposes, objectives and funding schemes in no way represents the total thrust of student interaction, that emphasis is considered to be essential at this point in the Commission's life.

Finally, these limitations were compounded by the unavailability of staff to support this Review. Thus the report does not reflect staff expertise.

In conclusion, words of appreciation must be expressed to the many people that contributed to the Review. Particular appreciation must go to Dan Crippen, Research Coordinator for the project, the National Commission's Denver office for arduous mailing and typing duties, to Editor Bess Earp, and to Drs. Sherry Manning and James Farmer for their many helpful suggestions.

Most importantly, a thank you must go out to all the students of American postsecondary education who responded in hopes that their effort may contribute to a better tomorrow.

Tim R. Engen, Commissioner
November 6, 1973

A Note—One Year Later. . . .

The National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, in an effort to build an analytical framework, established a set of national objectives. These objectives represented a fundamental statement of what might be termed the national interest in the years ahead. Although the Commission chose not to pass judgement on these objectives nor rank them for the benefit of policy-makers, their presence in the Commission's report prompted extensive discussions among American students. This study was an effort to elucidate student thought patterns and an effort to thrust the essential questions raised by the discussion of objectives/purposes into the public eye.

In November, 1973, this study was presented to the National Commission. Since this first official hearing a host of educational groups and interested students have called for a greater distribution of the Survey in its entirety. The assumption behind such a calling is that policy discussions of educational finance cannot and should not be made without a scrutiny of student response. Furthermore, the Survey of Student Response sufficiently documents that all current and proposed funding strategies are inextricably bound to discussions of purposes/objectives. It is hoped that this articulation of student response can provide a meaningful supplement to the discussions and the policies yet to be determined.

One year after the completion of this study, in cooperation with the National Student Educational Fund, the Student Committee of the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, and Michigan State University, the Survey of Student Response was published and distributed to a small representative sampling of students, legislators and educators. A special thank you must go to these groups for their sincere interest in surfacing student thought.

Tim R. Engen

SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS

Student Attitudes

1. Student attitudes are not a condition of society; they are an eminently powerful force that will impact all of postsecondary education.

2. Even without greater student participation, the student demand function will serve as an effective accountability mechanism in the future.

3. The idealism of equal opportunity objectives does not apply to student participation in institutional governance.

Educational Purposes

1. The National Commission has not considered nor altered the purposes of American postsecondary education.

2. The call for greater opportunities and greater options does not respond to the students' call for greater opportunities for self-development and employability.

3. The call for employability is broadly based; it is not isolated in any particular sector of postsecondary education.

4. The Renaissance man and those demanding gainful employment have the same need: to express one's self-development.

5. While formal instruction and institutionalization do not prohibit self-development, they do inhibit it.

6. The call for employability will remain as long as the expectations of postsecondary education participation and completion are not met.

7. To respond to the call for employability, a new orientation throughout all of American education is required.

8. If the "learning force" is not accepted in its totality, the call for greater opportunities for self-development will go unheeded.

National Objectives

A. Access

1. The objectives, as delineated by the National Commission, are great American goals acceptable to the students of American postsecondary education.

2. Access without opportunity is not "opportunity."

3. If *universal* access is to be achieved, funding programs must consider the financial needs of those participants outside of traditionally targeted populations.

4. Universal access is a worthy goal, but to the extent that the accomplishment of this objective diverts from other areas of required reform, it may be counterproductive.

B. Opportunity

5. The need for programs of opportunity is an indictment of elementary and secondary education. While opportunity programs are needed, postsecondary education should not categorically accept the burden of performance that has been neglected at other levels.

6. The opportunity to participate should not unduly emphasize completion. Such an emphasis is a function of unfair and unwise credentialism.

C. Choice

7. A choice of program offerings that is responsive to student needs, desires, and capabilities supercedes the importance of institutional choice.

8. Institutional choice is an inappropriate and extralegal discussion. Such choice is a luxury until access and opportunity have been accomplished.

D. Institutional Independence

9. If greater opportunities and greater options can be offered, some loss of institutional independence is justified.

E. Excellence

10. While research and public service should not be deemphasized, instructional quality, in the context of access and opportunity, is required and should be reemphasized.

11. The "era of equalitarianism" is a *quantitative* achievement unless instructional quality is funded as the *qualitative* complement.

12. Funds for the improvement of instruction in postsecondary education must accompany the funding schemes aimed at access and opportunity.

F. Student Responsibility

13. Students are responsible in their use of public funds and in achieving progress toward individualized academic goals.

14. A great majority of students are willing to share the responsibility for the funding of postsecondary education.

15. There are extenuating circumstances when the call for student responsibility is unrealistic. Defaulting loans may be less a symptom of student responsibility than a result of unfair

repayment schedules and need analysis formulas.

16. The call for student responsibility warrants a call for responsibility from all other constituents and funders of postsecondary education.

G. Institutional Accountability

17. The students, as major funders of postsecondary education, have few, if any, effective accountability mechanisms and have little to say about the allocation of institutional resources.

18. Students must be considered in the determination and use of accountability procedures.

19. A greater sophistication of student participation is in the offing. The decisions of faculties, administrators, legislators, and taxpayers will be viewed with greater scrutiny than in past years.

H. Diversity-Flexibility

20. "Diversity and flexibility" is the salient student concern.

21. The existent "diversity and flexibility" of programs is not sufficient in number or in structure. Renewal and reform are required to respond to student needs.

22. "Diversity-flexibility" is a "pivotal" objective. Without its accomplishment, student needs go unattended, access is a quantitative achievement, and instructional quality has no home.

Status Quo Programs

1. If opportunity costs are not seriously considered and eventually incorporated into financial assistance programs, rising costs will price a considerable number of potential postsecondary education participants out of the marketplace.

2. The present need analysis formulas are unrealistic and do not reflect, in many cases, the ability to pay.

3. Middle-income families caught outside the eligibility requirements of financial assistance but within severe economic constraints must be considered as qualified recipients for financial assistance along with low-income and minority groups.

4. Even "full funding" of present programs will not achieve desired outcomes unless there is more adequate dissemination of information and less bureaucracy in their administration.

5. The adoption of a modified voucher plan (BEOG) was a dramatic step towards: (1) student choice and (2) accepting student responsibility.

Alternative Funding Proposals

1. Voucher Plan Grants
   A unified grant program directed neither toward nor away from present target populations, but to include a significant portion of the project "exclusion" group, is essential. Such a grant program, based primarily on *realistic* need, must provide for a substantial part of the total costs of PSE.

2. Income–Contingent Loans
   Loans should be made available to expand the horizons of choice and better meet *individual* needs. Such a loan program should have primary emphasis on a flexible repayment schedule in terms of both time and amount. Loans should be structured to avoid overburdening students upon completion.

3. State Scholarship Programs
   Incentives should be provided to encourage state governments to formulate and adequately fund scholarships. An extensive scholarship program would not only enhance choice but also allow access on the basis of academic ability.

4. Realistic Need Analysis
   Need analysis should accurately reflect, as the name implies, need. Students feel that present need accounting does not, in fact, accurately indicate the ability to pay. The expected large parental contribution of the middle-income families is *not* realistic. Calculating the average rate of return of capital investments and adding it to net taxable income is *not* realistic. Assuming a standard student contribution is *not* realistic.

5. Expansion of Improvement Programs
   The overwhelming student support for improvement of PSE and the Commission objectives, the realization that improvements must accompany expansion, and the institutional struggle for survival in light of declining enrollments all clearly illustrate the need for diversity, flexibility, and innovation. Institutions of PSE must be allowed the chance (and perhaps be goaded into it) to develop new classes, curriculums, and programs. The present Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), funded at $10 million in FY '73, is not enough to insure or even facilitate the need for improvement.

6. Institutional Block Grants for Opportunity
   As expanded grant programs may provide additional access, so must funding schemes be developed to supplement the new access with opportunity. Expensive, but important, opportunity programs will answer the question, "What do I do after I'm accepted?"

7. Institutional Block Grants for Instructional Quality
   The concept of PSE as endorsed by the Commission is providing an educational experience to those who participate–the emphasis is on learning. This concept, as defined by students, requires instructional quality. To ease the competition for research monies, institutional grants for instructional quality are a necessity, not a luxury.

SURVEY OF STUDENT RESPONSE

A. Description of Survey Instrument

The survey was developed with the underlying philosophy of uncovering basic attitudes of students. An attempt was made to incorporate as many issues confronting the Commission as possible. The questions were framed around discussions of key issues/objectives within the Commission utilizing existing Commission material. Issues/objectives deemed appropriate to the Commission and the student populace were included. Several questions were prompted by the initial student review sessions in Denver. Each primary objective as described by the Commission served as an introduction to broad areas of investigation. In many areas, tradeoffs were introduced within the category to temper blanket approval of stated objectives. As with any surveys, questions were reworded in several instances to test consistency and comprehension. Rankings of objectives and purposes were included to discover priorities and preferences.

Much of the same individual background data as was utilized in the Carnegie survey was requested. Several additional items pertaining to costs and resources were queried. (See survey questions 1 through 17.) (See Appendix III-1 for complete survey.)

Institutions were selected in a random fashion from the Office of Education Directory for 1972-73. A dichotomy was created between two-year institutions and all others. In each category, the institutions were sorted into seven enrollment groups: less than 500; 500 to 1,000; 1,000 to 2,000; 2,000 to 5,000; 5,000 to 10,000; 10,000 to 25,000; and more than 25,000. Quotas were assigned to each group and subgroup on the basis of the percentage of total student population that each represented according to the OE Directory. Of the ten thousand surveys, approximately 7,000 were sent to institutions of higher education and 3,000 to two-year institutions. (See Appendix III-2 for complete mailing list and population figures.)

Distribution of the survey was accomplished by the presidents of the selected institutions. The accompanying letter urged a random selection as time and facilities allowed. It was administered in this manner for primarily two reasons: (1) time of year, and (2) time available to administer and analyze the survey. Consideration was given to utilizing the ACE files for selection and distribution. These files were not used because of severe time constraints, the difficulties the Carnegie Commission realized, and the limitation of administering the survey at only those institutions on the ACE files.

Surveys were returned to the Denver office for collection and coding. The surveys were then forwarded to the University of South Dakota for analysis

Due to time and cost, every second survey returned was analyzed. Statistical analysis of the data was performed by computer. Demographic data and answers were loaded onto tape from the scan sheets included with the survey. Cross-tabulations were performed and IBM PSTAT files assessed for statistical tests of validity and association. Approximately 250 comparisons were made and are available in hard copy. It should be noted that each question could be analyzed in light of each of the 20 demographic variables and each of the other questions. Since only the obvious demographic variables were run against each question, further analysis of the raw data is possible. The three groups of rank orderings were analyzed by simply calculating the percentage of first preference responses for each item within each group. (See Appendix III-3 for sample printout, statistical tests used and full listing of cross-tabs.)

B. Description of Participants

		Percentage
1.	Sex	
	(0) Male	
	(1) Female	
2.	Race	
	(0) Black	16.3
	(1) Native American	22.1
	(2) Oriental	1.9
	(3) White	57.7
	(4) Spanish Surnamed	1.2
	(5) Other	0.9
3.	Religion	
	(0) Protestant	
	(1) Catholic	
	(2) Jewish	
	(3) Other	
	(4) None	
4.	Parental income	
	(0) Less than $6,000	21.2
	(1) $6,000–$9,999	21.7
	(2) $10,000–$14,999	22.8
	(3) $15,000–$20,000	19.5
	(4) Greater than $20,000	14.8
5.	Father's education	
	(0) 1-3 years high school or less	23.3
	(1) High school graduate	33.4
	(2) 1-3 years postsecondary	18.7
	(3) B.A. or postgraduate degree	24.5
6.	Mother's education	
	(0) 1-3 years high school or less	
	(1) High school graduate	
	(2) 1-3 years postsecondary	
	(3) B.A. or postgraduate degree	
7.	Personal income	
	(0) Less than $1,000	37.4
	(1) $1,000–$1,999	14.5
	(2) $2,000–$4,999	14.1
	(3) $5,000–$10,000	18.6
	(4) Greater than $10,000	13.5

		Percentage
8.	Personal education	
	(0) 8th grade or less	14.9
	(1) 10th grade or less	5.3
	(2) 12th grade or less	11.9
	(3) 14th grade or less	32.2
	(4) 16th grade or less	30.5
	(5) Graduate degree	5.2
9.	High school grade point average	
	(0) C and below	7.8
	(1) B-, C+	30.1
	(2) B+, B	40.4
	(3) A, A-	21.5
10.	Present grade point average	
	(0) C and below	9.0
	(1) B-, C+	30.3
	(2) B+, B	41.4
	(3) A, A-	19.2
11.	Field of study	
	(0) Vocational-technical	9.5
	(1) Business	22.6
	(2) Social science	16.0
	(3) Humanities	9.7
	(4) Fine arts	3.8
	(5) Education/social welfare	12.4
	(6) Engineering	4.3
	(7) Health	5.5
	(8) Natural sciences	6.8
	(9) Other	9.4
12.	Year in postsecondary education	
	(0) Entered in 1973	22.5
	(1) Entered in 1972	21.8
	(2) Entered in 1971	17.8
	(3) Entered in 1970	20.6
	(4) Before 1970	17.3
13.	Length of program	
	(0) 1 year or less	26.5
	(1) 2 years	12.3
	(2) 3 years	2.2
	(3) 4 years	39.8
	(4) More than 4 years	19.1

		Percentage
14.	Presently enrolled in	
	(0) 1 institution	
	(1) 2 or more institutions	
15.	One year tuition costs	
	(0) Below $250	22.4
	(1) $250–$499	21.7
	(2) $500–$999	27.9
	(3) $1,000–$2,000	15.1
	(4) Above $2,000	8.7
16.	Presently receiving primary support for education from:	
	(0) Own income	32.9
	(1) Parents	29.8
	(2) Loans	10.9
	(3) Federal grants	10.3
	(4) State grants	4.0
	(5) Institutional scholarships	3.2
	(6) Work-study program	1.7
	(7) Other	7.1
17.	Self-described political leaning	
	(0) Strong or moderate conservative	31.2
	(1) Middle-of-the-road	43.2
	(2) Liberal	22.6
	(3) Left	3.0

		Percentage Returned	*Percentage Mailed*
92.	Institutional Size–Enrollment		
	(0) Less than 500	1.5	2.0
	(1) 500–999	8.4	4.9
	(2) 1,000–1,999	11.1	9.3
	(3) 2,000–4,999	14.8	17.5
	(4) 5,000–9,999	12.4	21.9
	(5) 10,000–25,000	33.7	32.9
	(6) More than 25,000	17.7	11.9

93.	Highest program offering	
	(0) 2 but less than 4 years	19.4
	(1) 4 or 5-year baccalaureate	28.0
	(2) First professional degree	2.6
	(3) Masters	19.0
	(4) Beyond Masters but less than Doctorate	0.3
	(5) Doctorate	30.6

		Percentage Returned	*Percentage Mailed*
94.	Institutional Type		
	(0) 2-year terminal occupational		
	2-year bachelor's creditable	21.4	30.0
	(1) Liberal arts		
	Teacher preparatory	59.8	70.0
	(2) Professional	12.8	

C. Summary Data

The following index lists the cross-tabs displayed in the Tab III-C. As noted before, additional cross-tabs were calculated and many more are possible. It should also be noted that percentage figures will not always equal 100 due to missing answers and demographic data, as well as multiple answers in either category.

Index

III-C-1 Need for Flexibility by Field of Study
III-C-2 Employability of Curriculum by Field of Study
III-C-3 Desirability of Flexibility by Field of Study
III-C-4 Desirability of Flexibility Assuming Higher Tuition by Field of Study
III-C-5 Effectiveness of Internship Programs by Field of Study
III-C-6 Effectiveness of Internship Programs by Institutional Type
III-C-7 Adequacy of Present Internship Programs by Field of Study
III-C-8 Adequacy of Present Internship Programs by Institutional Type
III-C-9 Efficiency and Effectiveness of Resources by Primary Source of Support
III-C-10 Efficiency and Effectiveness of Resources by Yearly Tuition Costs
III-C-11 Student Responsibility by Yearly Tuition Costs
III-C-12 Student Responsibility by Primary Source of Support
III-C-13 Agreement with Loan Cancellation by Primary Source of Support
III-C-14 Criteria for Determination of Student Aid by Parental Income
III-C-15 Criteria for Determination of Student Aid by Present G.P.A.
III-C-16 Criteria for Determination of Student Aid by Institutional Type
III-C-17 Desirability of Opportunity by Level of Educational Attainment
III-C-18 Adequacy of Secondary Education by Level of Educational Attainment
III-C-19 Adequacy of Secondary Education by Field of Study
III-C-20 Need for Adequate Financial Resources by Personal Income
III-C-21 Adequacy of Present Resources by Parental Income
III-C-22 Adequacy of Present Resources by Personal Income
III-C-23 Adequacy of Present Resources by Yearly Tuition Costs
III-C-24 Adequacy of Present Resources by Primary Source of Support
III-C-25 Complicated and Difficult Nature of Financial Aid by Personal Income
III-C-26 Desirability of Multiple Funding by Parental Income
III-C-27 Desirability of Multiple Funding by Yearly Tuition Costs
III-C-28 Appropriateness of Parental Support by Parental Income
III-C-29 Appropriateness of Parental Support by Personal Income

Index

III-C-30 Appropriateness of Parental Support by Primary Source of Support
III-C-31 Desirability of Student Loans to Parental Support by Parental Income
III-C-32 Desirability of Student Loans to Parental Support by Personal Income
III-C-33 Appropriateness of Student Contribution by Parental Income
III-C-34 Appropriate *Primary* Support for PSE by Parental Income
III-C-35 Appropriate *Primary* Support for PSE by Personal Income
III-C-36 Appropriate *Primary* Support for PSE by Yearly Tuition Costs
III-C-37 Student Status by Length of Educational Program
III-C-38 Student Status by Yearly Tuition
III-C-39 "PSE Produces Quantity, Not Quality" by Institutional Type
III-C-40 Satisfaction by Institutional Type
III-C-41 Rankings of All Objectives
III-C-42 Rankings of Choice, Opportunity, Access
III-C-43 Rankings of Purposes
III-C-44 Percentage of Affirmative Responses to All Questions

III-C-1 Need for Flexibility by Field of Study

Postsecondary education should offer programs with sufficient flexibility to accommodate the changing needs of individuals and society.

(Aggregate response: Agree 89%, Disagree 11%)

Field of Study	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
vocational-technical	70.9
business	86.0
social science	86.1
humanities	78.9
fine arts	97.7
education/social welfare	97.9
engineering	100.0
health	100.0
natural sciences	94.9
other	95.3

III-C-2 **Employability of Curriculum by Field of Study**

The present curriculums should be designed to make the graduate more employable.

(Aggregate response: Agree 83%, Disagree 17%)

Field of Study	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
vocational-technical	73.9
business	76.6
social science	76.1
humanities	62.5
fine arts	90.9
education/social welfare	97.2
engineering	94.0
health	98.4
natural sciences	97.5
other	93.5

III-C-3 **Desirability of Flexibility by Field of Study**

Institutions should keep program offerings up to date.

(Aggregate response: Agree 92%, Disagree 8%)

Field of Study	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
vocational-technical	75.5
business	89.6
social science	89.7
humanities	89.3
fine arts	97.7
education/social welfare	98.6
engineering	100.0
health	96.9
natural sciences	98.7
other	98.1

III-C-4 **Desirability of Flexibility Assuming Higher Tuition by Field of Study**

Institutions should keep program offerings up to date even if it means higher tuition.

(Aggregate response: Agree 82%, Disagree 18%)

Field of Study	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
vocational-technical	91.9
business	79.5
social science	83.5
humanities	92.7
fine arts	74.4
education/social welfare	79.4
engineering	80.0
health	73.4
natural sciences	75.9
other	77.6

III-C-5 **Effectiveness of Internship Programs by Field of Study**

On-the-job training or internship programs make education more valuable.

(Aggregate response: Agree 83%, Disagree 17%)

Field of Study	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
vocational-technical	68.2
business	78.6
social science	79.3
humanities	56.0
fine arts	86.4
education/social welfare	96.5
engineering	98.0
health	98.4
natural sciences	98.7
other	95.4

III-C-6 **Effectiveness of Internship Programs by Institutional Type**

On-the-job training or internship programs make education more valuable.

Institutional Type	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
two-year	77.0
liberal arts/teacher preparatory	92.2
professional	95.2

III-C-7 **Adequacy of Present Internship Programs by Field of Study**

Present internship programs are adequate.

Field of Study	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
vocational-technical	81.7
business	59.9
social science	47.2
humanities	66.0
fine arts	46.5
education/social welfare	44.1
engineering	30.6
health	41.7
natural sciences	26.7
other	34.3

III-C-8 **Adequacy of Present Internship Programs by Institutional Type**

Present internship programs are adequate.

Institutional Type	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
two-year	67.1
liberal arts/teacher preparatory	36.8
professional	34.2

III-C-9 **Efficiency and Effectiveness of Resources by Primary Source of Support**

Institutions are presently using financial resources efficiently and effectively.

(Aggregate response: Agree 48%, Disagree 52%)

Primary Source of Support	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
personal income	50.5
parents	45.3
loans	66.1
federal grants	80.8
state grants	71.8
institutional scholarships	31.3
work-study	47.1
other	39.4

III-C-10 **Efficiency and Effectiveness of Resources by Yearly Tuition Costs**

Institutions are presently using financial resources efficiently and effectively.

Yearly Tuition Costs	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
below $250	53.7
$250-$499	54.3
$500-$999	40.8
$1,000-$2,000	40.6
above $2,000	37.8

III-C-11 **Student Responsibility by Yearly Tuition Costs**

Students should be responsible in maintaining progress toward a specific academic goal.

Yearly Tuition Costs	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
below $250	68.2
$250-$499	73.9
$500-$999	83.7
$1,000-$2,000	86.7
above $2,000	86.3

III-C-12 Student Responsibility by Primary Source of Support

Students should be responsible in maintaining progress toward a specific academic goal.

Primary Source of Support	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
personal income	68.4
parents	84.2
loans	62.2
federal grants	50.5
state grants	58.5
institutional scholarships	97.0
work-study	100.0
other	88.9

III-C-13 Agreement with Loan Cancellation by Primary Source of Support

If students fail to find employment after graduation, they would be justified in applying for suspension or cancellation of any educational loans.

(Aggregate response: Agree 51%, Disagree 49%)

Primary Source of Support	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
personal income	49.8
parents	44.7
loans	68.2
federal grants	73.1
state grants	82.9
institutional scholarships	45.5
work-study	35.3
other	31.0

III-C-14 Criteria for Determination of Student Aid by Parental Income

Student aid should be determined by financial need rather than academic ability.

(Aggregate response: Agree 74%, Disagree 26%)

Parental Income	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
less than $6,000	86.2
$6,000–$9,999	79.5
$10,000–$14,999	68.1
$15,000–$20,000	72.8
above $20,000	57.6

III-C-15 Criteria for Determination of Student Aid by Present G.P.A.

Student aid should be determined by financial need rather than academic ability.

Present G.P.A.	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
C and below	90.2
B-, C+	77.8
B+, B	73.7
A, A-	59.4

III-C-16 Criteria for Determination of Student Aid by Institutional Type

Student aid should be determined by financial need rather than academic ability.

Institutional Type	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
two-year	82.7
liberal arts/teacher preparatory	65.0
professional	60.5

III-C-17 Desirability of Opportunity by Level of Educational Attainment

Postsecondary education should make available academic assistance and counseling that will enable each individual, according to his needs, capability and motivation to achieve his educational objectives.

(Aggregate response: Agree 95%, Disagree 5%)

Level of Educational Attainment	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
8th grade or less	83.8
10th grade or less	79.0
12th grade or less	95.7
14th grade or less	97.1
16th grade or less	97.2
graduate degree	98.3

III-C-21 Adequacy of Present Resources by Parental Income

The present funding structure is adequate.

(Aggregate response: Agree 39%, Disagree 61%)

Parental Income	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
below $6,000	54.7
$6,000–$9,999	44.2
$10,000–$14,999	25.0
$15,000–$20,000	33.5
greater than $20,000	34.4

III-C-22 Adequacy of Present Resources by Personal Income

The present funding structure is adequate.

Personal Income	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
less than $1,000	24.5
$1,000–$1,999	20.9
$2,000–$4,999	32.5
$5,000–$10,000	62.0
greater than $10,000	63.4

III-C-23 Adequacy of Present Resources by Yearly Tuition Costs

The present funding structure is adequate.

Yearly Tuition Costs	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
below $250	41.5
$250–$499	47.0
$500–$999	26.5
$1,000–$2,000	30.5
above $2,000	23.9

III-C-24 Adequacy of Present Resources by Primary Source of Support

The present funding structure is adequate.

Primary Source of Support	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
personal income	42.5
parents	31.5
loans	46.7
federal grants	64.1
state grants	43.2
institutional scholarships	21.2
work-study	52.9
other	34.3

III-C-25 Complicated and Difficult Nature of Financial Aid by Personal Income

Present financial aid programs are difficult to understand and the application process is complicated.

(Aggregate response: Agree 61%, Disagree 39%)

Personal Income	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
less than $1,000	77.0
$1,000–$1,999	74.8
$2,000–$5,000	62.6
$5,000–$10,000	41.5
greater than $10,000	36.1

III-C-26 Desirability of Multiple Funding by Parental Income

The responsibility for financing postsecondary education should be shared by a combination of public and private sources, including federal, state, and local government, and by students, parents and other concerned individuals and organizations.

(Aggregate response: Agree 87%, Disagree 13%)

Parental Income	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
less than $6,000	79.8
$6,000–$9,999	86.4
$10,000–$14,999	92.6
$15,000–$20,000	90.1
greater than $20,000	84.2

III-C-27 Desirability of Multiple Funding by Yearly Tuition Costs

The responsibility for financing postsecondary education should be shared by a combination of public and private sources, including federal, state, and local government, and by students, parents and other concerned individuals and organizations.

Yearly Tuition Costs	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
below $250	83.6
$250–$499	87.1
$500–$999	89.9
$1,000–$2,000	90.2
above $2,000	91.7

III-C-28 Appropriateness of Parental Support by Parental Income

Parents should be considered as a source of financing postsecondary education.

(Aggregate response: Agree 58%, Disagree 42%)

Parental Income	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
less than $6,000	46.3
$6,000–$9,999	58.0
$10,000–$14,999	63.1
$15,000–$20,000	56.8
greater than $20,000	71.8

III-C-29 Appropriateness of Parental Support by Personal Income

Parents should be considered as a source of financing postsecondary education.

Personal Income	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
less than $1,000	69.6
$1,000–$1,999	64.7
$2,000–$4,999	49.4
$5,000–$10,000	45.0
greater than $10,000	50.3

III-C-30 **Appropriateness of Parental Support by Primary Source of Support**

Parents should be considered as a source of financing postsecondary education.

Primary Source of Support	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
personal income	50.8
parents	74.8
loans	53.6
federal grants	38.8
state grants	35.9
institutional scholarships	54.5
work-study	52.9
other	69.4

III-C-31 **Desirability of Student Loans to Parental Support by Parental Support**

Student loans would be preferable to parental contributions.

(Aggregate response: Agree 47%, Disagree 53%)

Parental Income	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
less than $6,000	42.3
$6,000–$9,999	46.9
$10,000–$14,999	53.1
$15,000–$20,000	47.5
greater than $20,000	40.6

III-C-32 **Desirability of Student Loans to Parental Support by Personal Income**

Student loans would be preferable to parental contributions.

Personal Income	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
less than $1,000	45.4
$1,000–$1,999	53.3
$2,000–$4,999	55.0
$5,000–$10,000	46.0
greater than $10,000	39.2

III-C-33 Appropriateness of Student Contributions by Parental Income

Students should pay a share of the cost of their education.

(Aggregate response: Agree 91%, Disagree 9%)

Parental Income	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
less than $6,000	88.8
$6,000–$9,999	91.4
$10,000–$14,999	94.1
$15,000–$20,000	93.2
greater than $20,000	84.3

III-C-34 Appropriate Primary Support for PSE by Parental Income

Postsecondary education should derive its primary financial support from:
0) parents, 1) students, 2) federal government, 3) state government, 4) local government

	Parental Income					
	less than $6,000	$6,000–$9,999	$10,000–$14,999	$15,000–$20,000	greater than $20,000	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
Parents	31.9	25.4	7.0	20.7	15.0	Row percent
	28.8	22.6	6.0	20.4	19.5	Column percent
Students	26.0	21.5	19.0	20.1	13.5	
	31.8	25.9	21.8	26.9	23.8	
Federal Government	16.2	21.1	28.6	18.4	15.7	
	25.4	32.6	42.1	31.5	35.4	
State Government	14.2	18.7	33.3	19.2	14.6	
	13.1	17.2	29.0	19.4	19.5	
Local Government	15.4	30.8	15.4	30.8	7.7	
	0.8	1.7	0.8	1.9	0.6	

III-C-35 Appropriate Primary Support for PSE by Personal Income

Postsecondary education should derive its primary financial support from:
0) parents, 1) students, 2) federal government, 3) state government, 4) local government

Personal Income

	less than $1,000	$1,000–$2,000	$2,000–$5,000	$5,000–$10,000	greater than $10,000	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
Parents	19.2	5.5	8.2	34.7	28.3	Row Percent
	10.1	7.3	11.2	34.9	38.7	Column Percent
Students	23.3	14.9	14.2	26.4	18.9	
	16.7	26.7	26.2	35.8	35.0	
Federal Government	51.0	16.2	15.4	10.7	5.2	
	47.1	37.6	36.9	18.8	12.5	
State Government	43.8	19.6	17.9	9.8	8.5	
	23.7	26.7	25.0	10.1	11.9	
Local Government	53.3	20.0	6.7	6.7	13.3	
	1.9	1.8	0.6	0.5	1.2	

III-C-36 Appropriate Primary Support for PSE by Yearly Tuition Costs

Postsecondary education should derive its primary financial support from:
0) parents, 1) students, 2) federal government, 3) state government, 4) local government

Yearly Tuition Costs

	below $250	$250–$499	$500–$999	$1,000–$2,000	above $2,000	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
Parents	25.8	30.5	15.8	10.0	6.8	Row percent
	20.2	24.6	10.0	11.5	14.0	Column Percent
Students	22.3	28.1	24.8	12.4	5.1	
	25.2	32.6	22.7	20.6	15.1	
Federal Government	18.4	16.0	32.4	20.2	11.7	
	28.5	25.4	40.8	46.1	47.3	
State Government	24.6	17.4	33.9	15.2	8.5	
	22.7	16.5	25.4	20.6	20.4	
Local Government	46.7	13.3	6.7	20.0	—	
	2.9	.8	.6	.1	—	

III-C-37 Student Status by Length of Educational Program

Students should be recognized as legal adults and receive all the rights accorded that status.

(Aggregate response: Agree 70%, Disagree 30%)

Length of Program	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
1 year or less	25.0
2 years	80.1
3 years	80.0
4 years	87.5
more than 4 years	84.5

III-C-38 Student Status by Yearly Tuition

Students should be recognized as legal adults and receive all the rights accorded that status.

Yearly Tuition Costs	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
below $250	62.7
$250-$499	62.4
$500-$999	80.4
$1,000-$2,000	81.9
above $2,000	90.5

III-C-39 "PSE Produces Quantity, Not Quality" by Institutional Type

Postsecondary education is designed to produce quantity, not quality.

(Aggregate response: Agree 42%, Disagree 58%)

Institutional Type	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
two-year	31.6
liberal arts/teacher preparatory	45.3
professional	57.1

III-C-40 Satisfaction by Institutional Type

I would rather be going to school now than doing anything else.

(Aggregate response: Agree 69%, Disagree 31%)

Institutional Type	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
two-year	74.6
liberal arts/teacher preparatory	66.2
professional	61.9

III-C-41 Rankings of All Objectives

Questions 73-81

	Percentage Ranks		
	1	1 & 2	1, 2 & 3
diversity-flexibility	13.8	27.7	41.8
access	15.4	27.4	37.9
opportunity	4.5	12.1	21.4
accountability	7.4	17.7	31.8
student responsibility	13.3	24.1	33.3
instructional quality	27.3	43.8	58.0
institutional independence	6.7	12.6	20.2
choice	10.0	22.0	33.8
support	20.6	37.0	50.5

III-C-42 Rankings of Choice, Opportunity, Access

Questions 82-83

	Percentage Ranks	
	1	1 & 2
choice	49	85
opportunity	21	56
access	29	61

III-C-43 Rankings of Purposes

Questions 85-91

	Percentage Ranks		
	1	1 & 2	1, 2 & 3
employability	25	48	68
income	16	37	56
general skill development	9	27	44
citizenship	4	11	21
sociability	14	22	33
self-development	34	47	63
transmission of values	3	13	25

III-C-44 Percentage of Affirmative Responses to All Questions

Question	Percentage who strongly agree or agree	Question	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
18	88.8	62	89.1
19	82.9	63	45.3
20	—	64	70.1
21	92.0	65	41.6
22	81.6	66	42.5
23	83.1	67	74.7
24	51.2	68	72.9
25	64.2	69	72.4
26	59.8	70	78.9
27	96.6	71	69.4
28	97.3	72	70.2
29	47.0		
30	54.2		
31	78.3		
32	48.2		
33	48.8		
34	75.9		
35	76.4		
36	75.3		
37	68.8		
38	51.2		
39	94.8		
40	94.1		
41	73.6		
42	91.0		
43	73.4		
44	74.5		
45	94.1		
46	87.3		
47	28.2		
48	27.0		
49	14.9		
50	13.7		
51	66.6		
52	83.9		
53	38.5		
54	60.8		
55	80.4		
56	86.8		
57	58.4		
58	44.0		
59	46.5		
60	35.4		
61	90.8		

REGIONAL REVIEW SESSIONS

The regional review sessions were held so that student response might be discussed and the implications behind those responses clarified. The reviews were also intended to augment survey data.

Site Selection

Locations for the regional reviews were determined using the following criteria:

1. geographic placement in the United States,
2. availability of participants by level of education,
3. institutional type,
4. program offerings,
5. interest of local government associations,
6. states maintaining uinque educational programs (e.g., California and New York), and
7. financial resources.

Participants

Participants for the regional review sessions were generally chosen at random by student government personnel or appropriate student liaison officers. Each regional contact was asked to select 15-40 students on the basis of year in school and the program they were enrolled in.

A concerted effort was made to include an adequate cross section of the students, programs and institutions of postsecondary education.

Table I lists the institutions represented and identifies the diversity of institutional types. Table II indicates the regions selected and the general student groups participating.

Cross Section-Scope

In all, 289 students participated representing 40 different institutions of postsecondary education. Preliminary analysis of the demographic data included on surveys administered at the review sessions indicated that an adequate cross section was reviewed. A wide diversity of educational programs was also apparent. (No effort was made to analyze and document this cross section thoroughly as statistical analysis was not the intent of the oral sessions.)

Contents

The review sessions were structured to include the following topics:

1. the nature, scope and purpose of the National Commission,

2. the educational context in 1973,

3. educational objectives/purposes,

4. trade-offs resulting from the inadequacy of financial resources,

5. present programs and alternative futures,

6. key educational issues,

7. free response-discussion of topics/concerns of importance to the group,

8. biases about postsecondary education, and

9. summary by participants.

In this flexible framework, both the work of the National Commission and the individual (often related) biases and concerns of the participants were discussed. An effort was made to review the survey instrument to determine:

1. the willingness to address the survey questions,

2. what the responses would be, and

3. the issues, objectives or purposes that were not included.

Recording the Responses

Notes and/or recordings were kept of all review sessions to insure that:

1. all responses would be recalled accurately,

2. session-by-session comparisons could be made, and

3. analysis of responses by geographic locale would be possible.

Table I

Institutions Represented
Regional Student Review Sessions

Allegheny College (Pennsylvania)
Arizona State University
Augustana College (Illinois)
Bradley University (Illinois)
California, University of - Berkeley
California, University of - Davis
California, University of - Los Angeles
Certified Welding Institute (Colorado)
Chemeketa Community College (Oregon)
City University of New York
Colorado Aero Tech
Columbia University (New York)
Denver, University of
Duke University (North Carolina)
Governor's State University (Illinois)
Hamilton College (New York)
Harper Community College (Illinois)
Harvard University
Hunter College (New York)
Illinois Central College
Illinois, University of - Chicago
Illinois, University of - Urbana
Illinois State University
Linn Benton Community College (Oregon)
Northern Illinois University
Northwestern University (Illinois)
Pacific School of Religion (California)
Pacific, University of (California)
Parks School of Business
Polytechnic College of Colorado
Polytechnic Institute of New York
Princeton University
San Francisco, University of
Sangamon State University (Illinois)
Sauk Valley Community College (Illinois)
South Dakota, University of
State University of New York - Albany
State University of New York - Binghamton
Vanderbilt University (Tennessee)
Western Illinois University
Williams College

Table II

Regional Student Discussions

	Location	Participants	Date
1.	Denver, Colorado	National Student Review (Leaders of National Associations)	March 11-12, 1973
2.	Springfield, Illinois	Association of Illinois Student Governments Conference on Higher Educational Financing	April 24, 1973
3.	Washington, D.C.	NASA Public Administration Institute	July 11, 1973
4.	Broomfield, Colorado	Colorado Aero Tech	August 20, 1973
5.	Denver, Colorado	Certified Welding Institute	August 21, 1973
6.	Denver, Colorado	Polytechnic College of Colorado	August 21, 1973
7.	Denver, Colorado	Parks School of Business	August 22, 1973
8.	Denver, Colorado	Electronic Technical Institute	August 23, 1973
9.	Salem, Oregon	Leaders - Oregon Community College Assn.	September 20, 1973
10.	Salem, Oregon	Students - Oregon Community Colleges	September 20, 1973
11.	Berkeley, California	Students - Bay Area Universities	September 27, 1973
12.	Berkeley, California	Students - University of California	September 28, 1973
13.	New York City	Students - City University of New York - City Colleges	September 29, 1973
14.	New York City	Students - State University of New York - Private Schools	September 29, 1973
15.	New York City	Graduate Students CUNY	September 30, 1973

Outcomes

(Outcomes will be displayed here as listings of general comments. Tabs E through H will assimilate all data and interpret their impact.)

1. Student Reactions to NCFPE

The students involved in the regional review sessions reacted to the Commission and its charge with mixed emotions. Some were skeptical and others hopeful about the worth of the Commission's efforts. Others noted that even though the stated objectives were perhaps too idealistic, the fact that someone had addressed the concept of *postsecondary* education and the associated nontraditional forms of education was a significant achievement. A third and smaller group was critical. It perceived the Commission as perpetuating and reinforcing what may be myths about education (education is an essential commodity for everyone, the rags to riches social expectation) and perhaps sacrificing quality for quantity in the form of universal access.

2. Student Response to Review Sessions

As expected, there were strong responses pro and con to the 3-6 hour reviews. The proponents saw the sessions as a forum for the expression of their impressions and experiences and an opportunity to be exposed to the issues facing postsecondary education nationally as well as the opportunity to provide input to national policy making. The more skeptical participants, the minority, could not see their input as a helpful addition to policy-making and could not fathom the voices of students being heard in Washington, D.C.

3. Student Response to Purposes of Postsecondary Education

Although emphasis varied across institutional lines, students in all sectors of postsecondary education were quick to establish a distinction between objectives and purposes.

Purposes are the desired outcomes society has assigned to postsecondary education while objectives are desired goals to retain or achieve outcomes. With this means-end analysis, students were skeptical of the Commission's discussion of objectives. Had the Commission assumed the purposes of postsecondary education were to remain unaltered or had the Commission assumed the nine objectives proposed would dramatically alter America's outlook on the purposes of postsecondary education? Students were quick to decide. The National Commission, in extending opportunity, was democratizing postsecondary education but the purposes—self development, sociability, employability, etc.—remain unchallenged and unchanged.

The indictment of such a posture was apparent as the students in the Regional Review Sessions and the Survey of Student Response demanded a change in emphasis.

The primary emphasis in the response from all sectors was on employment for two reasons: (1) income, and (2) personal satisfaction of pursuing one's interests (self-development). The strong emphasis on employment, especially in respect to income, was justified in light of the present job market, unsatisfied parental and social expectations, and the higher costs of postsecondary education including the ever-increasing opportunity costs. Education, especially postsecondary education, was seen as neither a necessary nor sufficient instrument for transmission of values, citizenship or sociability, all of which may be obtained either prior to postsecondary education or by other noneducational activities, e.g., employment.

4. Student Reactions to Objectives

The preponderance of each review session was structured around the topic of objectives of postsecondary education. The categories of student status and student responsibility were added to the Commission list because of the interest in these areas by the participants and the expertise with which these topics could be addressed. Adequacy of resources and responsibility for funding, although discussed, were not considered objectives by the students, but as issues more properly discussed in the context of alternative schemes and present programs.

At all sessions, students subjected Commission objectives to intense questioning and offered a diversity of interpretations and critical observations. Singularly, the objectives were generally approved, but the realization of trade-offs established clear priorities. Participants in all reviews questioned objectives in light of quantity versus quality: Are we perpetuating an enterprise of the masses and for the masses or addressing the inadequacies of the status quo? A final general comment addressed the observation of "postsecondary education in a vacuum." The Commission objectives were viewed as generally acceptable, but unless a serious effort is made to address the inadequacies of American elementary and secondary education and apply similar objectives there, the Commission's efforts may be an exercise in futility. Access and opportunity, for example, are great American goals, but asking postsecondary education to accept the burden of accomplishing them without a concentrated effort to improve the other educational levels make them improbable if not impossible achievements.

It proved difficult to rank all objectives in all reviews. On the basis of numerical ranking in some sessions, the following is a rough priority ordering of objectives as the students determined them:

1. access and opportunity
2. diversity and flexibility, excellence (instructional quality)
3. institutional accountability, student status
4. choice
5. institutional independence, student responsibility

Diversity and Flexibility

Without exception, diversity and flexibility formed the critical objective for the future of American postsecondary education—"there should be something there after we obtain access." In other words, if universal entry is not accompanied by a great number of options responsive to the changing needs of society and the student, access is self-defeating.

Other comments included:

*Program offerings should be current to meet changing needs.

*The primary obligation of postsecondary education is to offer students a diversity and flexibility of programs.

*A host of learning opportunities. It is the student's obligation to determine whether program completion is important.

*Internship programs should be encouraged as they offer a means to apply formal instruction and the flexibility to "stop in" and "stop out."

*Students are willing to pay more for expanded diversity and flexibility.

Excellence

*Unanimous consent was voiced for excellence, especially in respect to instructional quality. Excellence is more than an idealistic goal, it is a real need.

*The scholar is not necessarily the best teacher and the teacher is not necessarily the best scholar.

*Research is too ingrained in institutional support to be played down by a push for excellence of instructional quality.

Institutional Independence

Students generally did not have an institutional perspective and lacked background to discuss independence extensively. However, their commentary included:

*The support required to attain other objectives is more important than a loss of institutional independence.

*The maintenance of institutional independence has done little to create a greater diversity and flexibility of programs.

Institutional Accountability

The Commission objective reads: "Institutions of postsecondary education should use fiscal and other resources both efficiently and effectively and employ procedures sufficient to enable funders to determine whether resources are achieving desired outcomes."

In this statement the students preferred to see themselves as prime funders of postsecondary education—a fact long ignored in decision making—and noted that at present few accountability mechanisms exist that can allow the students to hold postsecondary education institutions accountable to them.

If some mechanisms presently exist they are:

1. inadequate, token efforts, or

2. unknown to the students

Suggested reforms included:

1. mandatory teacher evaluations,
2. the implementation of consumer philosophies of education,
3. student unionization and collective bargaining, and
4. greater participation in governing boards.

Student Responsibility

Participants responded that students should be held accountable and responsible if similar standards apply to institutions and governmental bodies.

*Defaults on loans should not be condoned, but there may be justification in some cases or default may be a result of a burdensome economic condition or an unfair repayment schedule.

*Financial responsibility of students should include payment of a portion of the costs and repayment of financial aid.

*Academic responsibility requires that a student make progress towards an academic goal consistent with that student's needs, motivation and desires. This does not mean completion. This does not prohibit stopping or even dropping out.

Access

The students concluded initial access appears to be a great national goal to eliminate barriers, both real and artificial, to postsecondary education. Other significant observations included:

*The massive funds required for access should not divert out attention from reforms of the status quo.

*Increased participation must be coupled with increased institutional quality.

*Money alone will probably not resolve the problems of access; other socio-economic and cultural factors must be considered.

*Access should not be directed at target groups, especially groups traditionally targeted by the federal government.

*Financial need analysis must become more realistic since taxable income does *not* correlate to the ability to pay.

*If the call for access implies that more education always yields more benefit, access could be a serious disappointment to institutions and students.

*Nontraditional education should not be ignored in providing access.

*Access should not be limited or directed to the institutional type of lowest cost.

*Extended access through grade 14 may not eliminate barriers of access after that level.

*Access may be very expensive in relation to other objectives and thus prohibit the accomplishment of Commission objectives or change in the status quo.

Choice

The Commission statement on choice confused students. Until a "reasonable choice" and the concept of choice were defined, this objective could not be discussed.

The debate between public and private institutions and whether monies would be made available for choice between public and private enrollment had been previously recognized by the students. Their philosophies were not unlike those involved in the conflict in all other circles of higher education.

Those students from private institutions supported choice. Those from the public sector determined choice to be an unaffordable luxury at least until access, opportunity, and diversity and flexibility had been met.

The consensus of the participants was that choice of program offerings is more important than choice among institutions that offer similar programs.

Opportunity

The students supported opportunity and realized that the intention of access cannot be fulfilled without opportunity programs. Other general comments include:

*Opportunity programs should not be designed to force completion.

*Secondary education is presently inadequate and must be coped with.

1. This education is inadequate as indicated by the documented need.
2. High school counseling is inadequate.
3. College preparatory curriculums in our high schools are overemphasized.

*Manpower needs should not be met by strong channeling but by improved counseling and accuracy of manpower projection.

Student Status

In all the review sessions the recommendation was that students should be afforded their rightful status as citizens and as *prime* funders of postsecondary education.

*Students should have a status equal to administrators and faculty in policy determination.

*Students are denied legal rights in discriminatory policies of housing, tuition, etc.

*Students have a right, and more importantly, an obligation to reform postsecondary education.

Trade-offs

The realization of limited resources and the multiplicity of demands in postsecondary education introduced many trade-offs. Although the most important objectives require large amounts of money, the participants noted increased appropriations alone will not automatically accomplish the goals.

*Access and opportunity are given priority over choice.

*Diversity and flexibility are high priorities, but do not require *massive* increases in tuition for realization.

*Instructional quality should take precedent over research and public service.

*The need for diversity and flexibility justifies a loss of institutional independence.

*The preponderance of student financial aid should continue to be based upon need rather than academic ability.

*Internships are well worth extending the time enrolled in postsecondary education.

*Student contributions to postsecondary education, where possible, and the accompanying independence that that implies are preferred to parental support.

*Improvement and expansion of the public sector is preferred to expansion of the private sector.

Status Quo Programs

No attempt was made to encompass all the present aid programs but rather to field impressions of aid programs with which the participants were familiar. On the whole, student comments represented a serious indictment of the philosophy and administration of status quo programs.

*Dissemination of information on present programs is inadequate.

*The application procedure with most status quo programs is cumbersome and confusing.

*Even though student costs of education are rising, the dollar amounts of aid programs seem to remain stable or to decrease.

*Loans are discriminatory, prohibitive and oftentimes burdensome, especially to middle-income families.

*There is a lack of continuity in federal appropriations to present aid programs.

*Present need analysis techniques provide an unrealistic picture.

*Education appears to be low in legislative priorities.

*Scholarship programs are inadequate.

*Basic opportunity grants and voucher plans are acceptable concepts.

*The present mix of funding sources of postsecondary education is improper.

*Grant programs stressing access are inferior unless institutional grants are allocated for opportunity programs.

*Increasing parental contributions resulting from rising costs diminish student status.

*Aid is available only while attending those institutions that OE recognizes thereby eliminating many nontraditional learning experiences.

*The federal emphasis on research deemphasizes the importance of instructional quality.

Alternative Funding Schemes

Based on answers to the questions of "who should pay?" an alternative funding model was developed. Pluralistic support was recognized as essential because if postsecondary education is, in fact, a social good, it should be supported by all of society.

*Students and parents should pay some of the costs if possible.

*Local governments should contribute if the situation warrants their involvement.

*States are presently contributing major portions of the costs.

*The federal government should assume a much larger role because of social benefits and the return on the investment in tax receipts and the increase in GNP.

*Full-cost pricing is totally unacceptable. Opportunity costs are already prohibitive and too burdensome.

*A unified grant program (voucher) based on need with higher appropriation ceilings should be established.

*State scholarship programs should be established or expanded to encourage academic excellence and access.

*A consistent, low-cost loan program should be provided to expand choice.

*Equalizing private/public tuition would be expensive and drive tuition up. Saving the private sector is not worth the cost involved.

The disadvantages of providing a program of two years of free postsecondary education were cited:

*The large cost would prevent the accomplishment of other objectives.

*Fourteen years of compulsory education could easily become a reality which would perpetuate the "importance" of formal instruction.

*The orientation towards more schooling may continue to erode the economic advantages of postsecondary education participation.

*It is doubtful that the occupational marketplace could fairly absorb the increase of graduates by offering them opportunities appropriate to levels of training.

EDUCATION PURPOSE FOR AMERICAN P.S.E.

What effect do student attitudes have upon the course of American Postsecondary Education? They are unpredictable and often ignored by educational planners. They are diverse and often misunderstood by legislators, faculties, administrators, and taxpayers.

Ultimately, the student, as consumer, serves a demand function that is likely to impact all the future conditions of enrollment, governmental support, institutional productivity, etc., as well as the accomplishment of national objectives.

Part I addresses the need to consider student attitudes and their impact on future conditions of PSE. Parts II-IV analyze student response to purposes, objectives, and financial adequacy and responsibility.

I. PSE Consumers and the Unpredictable Context

It would be a serious mistake in evaluating student reaction to PSE purposes, objectives, and financing schemes to omit conditions that are likely to impact postsecondary education. The National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education has focused upon these conditions and realized the significant impact such conditions could have on the future course of PSE. These major conditions are categorized as assumptions because of the unpredictability of their effects and are related to:

1. a changing postsecondary student mix,
2. trends in enrollments,
3. intersegmental enrollment shifts,
4. manpower needs,
5. STUDENT ATTITUDES,
6. public service,
7. nontraditional education,
8. new obstacles to change,
9. faculty unionization,
10. educational technology,
11. institutional productivity,
12. federal fiscal policies, and
13. trends in state support.

In the Survey of Student Response as well as the Regional Review Sessions, however, it became apparent that student attitudes are not just one of the many conditions likely to affect the course of PSE, but are an eminently powerful force that will affect all of postsecondary education. Regardless of levels of federal support, increases in productivity and the adoption of uniform cost standards, students' perceptions, decisions, and attitudes have had and will have a profound effect on American PSE.

Two of the conditions/assumptions identified by the Commission are selected here in an attempt to demonstrate the relationship between changes in PSE and student attitudes. All other conditions can be addressed similarly.

Assumption No. 1

Student attitudes and the new student mix

Ethnic and racial minorities, persons from low-income families, older persons, and women will make up an increasing proportion of the total enrollment in postsecondary education.

It is difficult to argue with this assumption in light of the enormous amounts of existing literature discussing the student mix of tomorrow. So prevalent is this bank of literature, however, that one wonders if postsecondary education is not attempting to convince itself that these alterations in the student population are going to happen. But, in fact, existing student attitude may have a profound effect on whether this assumption ever becomes a reality. The unpredictable intentions of the traditional age groupings (to enroll or not to enroll) may have forced educational planners to seek a new more predictable population of students.

Whether more women enroll in PSE is dependent upon society's granting women equality. Table I displays the percentage of women earning degrees. Although dramatic advances have been made since 1950 when only 32 per cent of the undergraduate enrollment was women, the enrollment alone has not insured significant employment opportunities.

Table I

Percentage of Women Enrolled and Earning Degrees–All U.S., 1969-1970

	% Women	Total Students
Undergraduate Enrollment	42	6,783,893
Baccalaureates	43	798,070
First Year Graduate Enrollment	40	527,834
Master's Degrees	40	209,387
Total Graduate Enrollment	35	816,207
Doctorates	14	29,872

Source: *Women in the Graduate Sector of the University*, Report of an Ad Hoc Committee of the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, June, 1972, Table A-1.

Student attitudes are also likely to influence the participation of minority and low-income groupings. The demands from minority groups for equalization of educational opportunities, suitability of program offerings, and the reform of financial assistance programs to include "opportunity costs" must not go unanswered if significant increases are to be noted in the participation rates of

these groups. Access funds, as well as funds channeled toward tutorial and remedial programs, may not suffice. Long-standing cultural and environmental attitudes may prevail. Access and opportunity may succeed, not because of the appropriations of funds to those areas, but because attitudes and levels of satisfaction of the student will encourage the anticipated new student mix to become a reality.

It may also be presumptuous to believe there is an apparent trend to life-long learning. While Americans may well have increasing leisure time, the attitudes of those considering recurrent learning will have to be incorporated in these learning opportunities or Americans will divert their leisure time elsewhere. Financial adequacy alone will not bring this assumption of a new student mix to fruition. Attitudes toward educational costs, instructional quality, and the course offerings are likely to have most bearing on whether or not such a mix becomes a reality.

Assumption No. 2

Student attitudes and enrollment growth

> Total enrollment in postsecondary education will continue to increase during the decade of the 1970's, but at a rate much reduced from that of the 1960's. In the decade of the 1980's, enrollment may decline somewhat before beginning a modestly upward climb once more after 1980. (See Table II)

Growth rates for PSE are usually determined by two important factors: (1) the graduation rate for high school students and (2) the percentage of the total population in the traditional college-age group. A third, often omitted, factor is the socio-psychological attitudes of students. Rather than argue Assumption No. 2, it is best to amend it to include ". . . depending upon the socio-psychological attitudes of students and events in society that may alter these attitudes."

Growth in PSE then is dependent upon a multiplicity of variables that are difficult to predict and even more difficult to survey. Other factors which may significantly alter enrollment predictions include:

1. The existence of a military draft or national crisis warranting conscription.
2. Student desire for independence.
3. Student perception of post-high school occupational opportunities.
4. Student perception of post-college occupational opportunities.
5. Student perception of individual ability to pay for the PSE experience.
6. Student desire and/or personal need to experience new environments.
7. Student acceptance or rejection of benefits yielded by the PSE experience.
8. Student reaction to peer group involvement in PSE.
9. Student evaluation of high school training and academic readiness for the PSE experience.
10. The student's acceptance or rejection of parental expectations.

It is in the context formed by these variables that students respond to PSE purposes, objectives, status quo priorities and alternative schemes. This context will impact all of PSE in the immediate future. While students are not the only participants in and funders of PSE, it has been demonstrated here and demonstrated historically that whether students enroll, whether students are satisfied, whether students are purchasing the product in the educational marketplace (demand),

and whether educational costs are consistent with student purchasing power are factors that ultimately determine the course of PSE. Even though students continue to lament infrequent participation in governing boards, the stagnancy of academic performance, ineffectual instruction, or the disappointing outcomes of PSE, students have altered the course of public, institutional and departmental policymaking through continuous and even unconscious demands for elimination of financial barriers, modification of program formats, etc. Even this retrospective rationalization, however, should not relegate student participation and input to a second level priority. Students do not presently have effective means to alter PSE *after they have enrolled.* The frustrations of discussion purposes and objectives is that the idealism of access, democracy-citizenship, self-development, opportunity, and choice may not be practical in the context of *institutional* governance.

Table II

Projections of the Populations of the United States By Age Group*

(in thousands)

	Actuals		Projections		
Age Groups	**1960**	**1970**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**
65 and over	10,392	20,949	24,051	27,768	28,842
45--64	36,200	42,695	43,489	44,974	58,238
25–44	47,140	50,126	62,332	78,693	77,391
20–24	11,124	18,219	21,067	17,823	19,216
15–19	13,455	20,101	20,221	17,262	21,048
under 14	49,221	56,748	52,970	60,120	59,695
TOTAL	167,532	[208,837]	[224,132]	[246,639]	264,430
Median Age	*29.4*	*28.1*	*29.6*	*31.8*	*34.0*

*U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Report,* Series P-25, No. 498, Series E projections, page 18, October, 1972.

Editor's Note: There are some discrepancies between the population by age groups and the total population. These discrepancies appear due to rounding.

II. Students and National Purposes for American PSE

(Note: To highlight the importance of this discussion, to emphasize the fundamental topic in PSE, the purposes will be included in the form of a formal presentation to the National Commission.)

"Toward What END Do We Direct PSE?"

(A Presentation to the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education)

Tim R. Engen, Commissioner

To members and staff of the National Commission:

Since last August I have been attempting to research and compile student attitudes pertinent to the work of this National Commission. In my extensive traveling, the communication with students has taught me a great deal, not only about *what* students think but, more significantly, *how* students think. Because of the intensely inquisitive manner of students, I've been told to keep the horse before the cart: to deal with the fundamental questions at hand before my analysis takes off into the controversial and emotional issues facing postsecondary education today.

In my contact with these students, I have learned to evaluate basic questions first because there lie the rudiments, the essence of what the Commission and American postsecondary education is all about. With this philosophy firmly cast in my skull, I am asking all of you to consider the basic question: *"Are we looking before we leap?"*

My topic is "Purposes of American Postsecondary Education." My intentions are not to ask for an entire reevaluation of Commission objectives or a philosophical evaluation of status quo programs, but to ask you to share with me some of the philosophies of students, philosophies that cannot be computerized.

In one of the regional review sessions a very vocal participant summarized for me his estimation of the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education:

> You are certainly in an unfortunate position. As a national commission you are asked to fund what already exists or develop alternative funding mechanisms to repair what has existed and now is threatened.

My immediate retort was that the Commission, although it certainly was not a reform body, could significantly alter the course of PSE because it had the "divine wisdom" to propose access, opportunity, and choice as national objectives. And he promptly responded that "you may be democratizing education, but the purposes remain unchecked, unchallenged, and unchanged."

That, members of the Commission, is a statement of some merit and a statement that challenges the creative thought process even after one year of arduous discussions of definitions, conditions, and expectations!

What are purposes in the context of American PSE? The students determined purposes to be

ends and objectives to be *means*. When the students were asked, "Toward what end do we finance postsecondary education?" they did not respond access, opportunity, and diversity. They responded "self-development and sociability." While greater opportunities to enroll may yield greater self-development, access is not an end, but a means.

Has the National Commission viewed the *ends* of PSE? Have we redefined, reemphasized or ignored educational purposes? Do our objectives assume the present purposes are adequate?

"Are we looking before we leap?"

My mind returns to a staff paper prepared by Mr. Raymond Thompson earlier this year on the history of American postsecondary education and the federal government. From the landmark Supreme Court decision in 1819 freeing Dartmouth College from threatening state control to the significance of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 and one of its products—the National Commission—it is apparent that the same purposes of postsecondary education have been reemphasized over time, but the traditionally accepted list of purposes has generally been retained.

The following are notable examples: (purposes in parentheses)

1845—Establishment of the Naval Academy (national defense)

1862—First Morrill Act (transmission of knowledge, skill development)

1901—Establishment of Army War College (national defense)

1918—Vocational Rehabilitation Training for Disabled Veterans (skill development, sociability)

1935—Establishment of National Youth Administration (employability)

1949—Smith-Mundt Act (sociability, citizenship)

1958—NDEA (skill development, citizen ship, transmission of knowledge)

Today, not unlike those significant times in the history of postsecondary education—1862 and 1935—the students enrolled or planning to enroll in postsecondary education are seeking a new emphasis. Never have the opportunities to enroll been greater. Never have the opportunities to receive substantial public assistance been greater, and never in the history of this country has enrollment for the 18-24 age group been so socially expected.

But while the students are cognizant of the great opportunities for entry, they are critical of the opportunities that await them upon completion. They may conclude that transmission of values, citizenship, and sociability are "givens" in the entire process of education, but the more idealistic outcomes of PSE—employability and self-development—are often unattainable.

This plea for new emphasis upon educational outcomes requires:

1. a reexamination of the employment orientation existent in postsecondary education and a public investment to expand opportunities for gainful employment, and

2. a concerted effort to incorporate nontraditional formal and informal learning opportunities to forward self-development and employability.

The solution, unfortunately, is not as simple as the expansion of internship programs. These are emphatic requests that are less a symptom of our economic woes and more a reaction to what the Newman Task Force calls "the coming era of equalitarianism." It is not a question of whether PSE is a social or individual benefit. It is the question of whether there is even a marginal benefit upon completion.

A. The Call for Employability Is a Predominant One

It was as apparent in the Regional Review Sessions as it is in the Survey of Student Response: students are accepting and respecting any transmission of values, citizenship, or sociability that results from the PSE experience, but are overwhelmingly skeptical if not fearful about postgraduate employment. Table I documents the extent of the call for employability and illustrates the first, first-second, and first-second-third priority rankings given to purposes.

Table I

Priority Rankings for Postsecondary Education Purposes*

Question: I am participating in postsecondary education for: (rank)

		1st priority	1-2 priority	1-2-3 priority
1.	employability	25%	48%	68%
2.	income	16	37	56
3.	general skill development	9	27	44
4.	citizenship	4	11	21
5.	sociability	14	22	33
6.	self-development	34	47	63
7.	transmission of values	3	13	25

*Discrepancies appear due to rounding (Source: Survey of Student Response, Questions 85-91)

While Table I forced the respondents to select from a host of purposes, their call for employment is further illustrated by Table II. The Survey of Student Response addressed itself to the following four questions in order to elicit responses to employability in the absence of other competing demands.

Table II

The Need for Greater Employment Orientation in PSE

Questions	Agree	Disagree
19. The present curriculums should be designed to make the graduate more employable.	83%	17%
25. Programs should be structured to meet specific manpower requirements of society.	64	36
23. On-the-job training or internship programs would make education more valuable.	83	17
50. High school counseling offers adequate knowledge of employment opportunities.	13	87

(Source: Survey of Student Response)

B. The Interpretation of Employability Is a Unique One

As Table I indicated, self-development was also considered to be a necessary purpose of post-secondary education. It is the relationship of self-development to employability, income, and skill development that constitutes a unique interpretation. The overwhelming emphasis in the discussion of education purposes was THE OPPORTUNITY TO EXPRESS ONE'S SELF-DEVELOPMENT. This means the expression of self-development is the form of: (1) occupational opportunity, income, and skill development, and (2) employment and deployment of knowledge for the benefit of self and society.

The uniqueness of such interpretation is that it allows the employment-oriented man to understand the concerns of the Renaissance man and vice versa. The pursuit of income and the pursuit of truth are both attempts to manifest the education received and transmit the knowledge for the benefit of society and self. Both attempts represent a frustration of the status quo to emphasize, ascertain, and/or better predict outcomes of PSE.

C. The Call for Greater Self-Development Is a Result of the Disenchantment and Limitation of Formal Instruction and Traditional Structure

While the students surveyed concluded there was a general satisfaction with the institutions they are presently enrolled in (79 per cent agreed, which is consistent with the Carnegie Commission's similar question in which 77 per cent of 100,000 students surveyed were generally satisfied), there were noticeable exceptions to that degree of satisfaction. Flexibility of offerings, diversity of offerings, and a general disillusionment with formal instruction were topics most likely to invoke negative responses. The satisfaction of self-development gained through a postsecondary experience was threatened or at least inhibited by traditional structure. Table III notes the overwhelming acceptance of the Commission-stated objectives "Diversity and Flexibility" as well as a strong affirmative response to the concept of "stopping in or out."

Table III

The Need for Greater Flexibility, Options, Change

Questions	Agree	Disagree
18. PSE should offer programs with sufficient flexibility to accommodate the changing needs of individuals and society.	89%	11%
26. Programs should be structured with the flexibility to "drop in" and "drop out."	60	40
67. Students have an obligation to attempt to reform PSE.	75	25

(Source: Survey of Student Response)

Furthermore, the results of Question 67 imply a strong desire to reform postsecondary education. The call for more options and modification of existing structures to enhance self-development was even more predominant in the Carnegie Commission Survey.

Table IV

Undergraduate Agreement With Reforms by Field of Study

	*Percentage who "strongly agree" or "agree with reservations"**									
	All fields	Social sciences	Humanities	Fine arts	Physical sciences	Biological sciences	Education/ Social welfare	Engineering	Health	Other professions
"Undergraduate education in America would be improved if:"										
"All courses were elective"	51	63	59	58	46	38	52	25	52	49
"Grades were abolished"	59	64	63	59	57	69	69	49	42	51
"Coursework were more relevant to contemporary life and problems"	91	94	87	95	88	93	98	85	88	95
"More attention were paid to the emotional growth of students"	83	87	83	89	79	80	83	78	88	85
"Students were required to spend a year in community service in the United States or abroad"	48	60	58	48	36	45	54	33	58	45
"There were less emphasis on specialized training and more on broad liberal education"	37	52	48	31	34	46	34	20	25	30
"Teaching effectiveness, not publications, should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty."	95	94	96	98	98	91	96	97	96	96

**Other possible responses: "disagree with reservations," "strongly disagree."*

(Source: Carnegie Commission)

While the call for reform and greater opportunities for self-development is firmly implanted in the often heard call for "relevance," many participants saw self-development inhibited by the isolationism of institutionalization. What Charles Reich calls "education for consciousness," and what Alvin Toffler calls "coping" is what most PSE institutions find difficult to offer.

The recently published UNESCO study concludes that "never have societies so completely rejected institutionalization." The students of American PSE support that viewpoint and find non-traditional outlets and options difficult to locate. And they also fear universal access and opportunity will continue to encourage institutionalization, perpetuate the limited values of formal instruction, and not free the PSE enterprise to seek out alternative futures.

Students seeking self-development through *learning* opportunities are offered *training* opportunities. Is the purpose of PSE learning or training?

"Are we looking before we leap?"

D. The Call for Employability Is a Fear of Unmet Expectations

It all begins when parental expectations of the social importance and material benefits of post-secondary education are impressed upon the student. The graphs displaying dramatic gains in lifetime income as a result of greater participation in PSE somehow infiltrate all levels of American education. Prior to enrollment in PSE, a preponderance of students expect:

1. greater earnings upon graduation,
2. a one-way ticket to upward mobility, and
3. a prestigious white collar occupation.

But today the long-accepted causality between educational achievement and income is in question and the Bureau of Labor Statistics notes that by 1980 only 15 per cent of the jobs in our society will "require" bachelor degrees. And as a result, many of the students are fearful of employment prospects, fearful of flooded markets, and suspicious as to whether their present fields of study will ultimately be utilized in future employment. (National statistics overwhelmingly say "no.") It seems that there are few students who are not personally acquainted with PSE graduates bagging groceries or driving cabs. To this extent the U.S. economy has had a significant impact upon the attitudes of the educational consumers. But an ever more significant fear was expressed.

E. The Call for Employability Is Not Necessarily a Temporary Sign of Economic Woes

Throughout many of the Regional Review Sessions there was a general suspicion that potential income and employment opportunities were being diminished because of the growing participation rate in PSE. As one student summarized, "the more you educate, the lower the pay rate!"

The contention expressed by many students was that the long-heralded expectations and the successful achievement of those expectations is a function only of an educated elite. The prolifer-

ation of educational opportunities will eventually relegate the material advantages of completion to the limited opportunities of a high school graduate. This is a substantive trade-off. Do we attempt to offer universal access and opportunity at the expense of dashing long-held social expectation and legitimation of those expectations? Obviously, the students responded "yes." But the point remains that the strain upon these expectations as a result of universal access is likely to perpetuate the emphatic call for employability for some years to come.

F. The Call for Employability Requires Major Attention Throughout American Education

The call for employability and the reason for the plea have been explored. But solutions and recommendations remain. The Regional Review Sessions produced four possible recommendations.

1. *Laissez-faire:* retain the present academic orientation and allow student expectations to "mellow" and the economic marketplace to readjust.

2. *Modified Laissez-faire:* attempt to improve the reliability of manpower predictions, the responsiveness of curriculums, and the quality and responsiveness of high school counseling.

3. *Incentives:* develop funding schemes to deemphasize flooded occupational markets, readjust the college-prep orientation of American high schools by providing strong alternatives in vocational and technical curriculums.

4. *Control:* adopt a manpower strategy that would require students to meet the specific manpower requirements of the nation.

The students concluded that alternative 2 is the most acceptable. Additional, accurate information will allow the educational and economic marketplace to function properly.

G. To Expand Opportunities for Self-Development Requires a Greater Acceptance of the Learning Force

Daniel Bell has described three dimensions to what he labels as a postindustrial society:

1. A shift from goods to services

2. The emergence of a large-scaled professional and technical class

3. The centrality of theoretical analysis as the source of innovation and policy analysis in society. (Daniel Bell, "Structural Changes in the U.S. Border Lines for the Year 2000")

It is the third dimension that is the most important.

While the National Commission has gone to extend the concept of the learning force beyond "traditional higher education," we are far from what Bertram Gross calls "the total number of

people developing their capacities through systematic education." While the National Commission has included new institutions of formal instruction, we have not addressed informal learning opportunities in society.

The call for greater opportunities for self-development will be satisfied when:

1. there is a philosophical acceptance of the value and impacts of informal learning opportunities,

2. there is a liberalization of governmental recognition and standards of accreditation, and

3. there is a recognition of the limitations of formal instruction and institutionalization.

"Are we looking or leaping?"

The National Commission has confronted the future goals of PSE which the American Council of Education prefers to call greater opportunities and greater options.

The students of American postsecondary education accept these goals but require that opportunities be viewed not only in terms of entry but in terms of outcomes and the options be viewed outside traditional structures.

The present purposes of PSE need a reevaluation and reemphasis. To place the horse before the cart requires that one question be asked: *Toward what END do we direct PSE?* It is not "toward what end" do we direct financial resources to achieve desired objectives. It is "toward what end" do we direct these objectives to achieve desired purposes.

NATIONAL OBJECTIVES FOR P.S.E.

Students and Objectives for American PSE

This general commentary will attempt to address:

1. the student thought process behind evaluation of objectives for PSE,
2. the student response to trade-offs existent in the context of a limited amount of financial resources,
3. the frame of reference of students in response to purposes of PSE,
4. the specific reactions/conclusions students have reached about educational issues, and
5. how these reactions and conclusions relate to the mainstream of Commission thought.

From the outset it must be concluded there was little dissension over most of the stated Commission objectives because they respond directly to what students perceived to be timely needs of PSE; they respond with little variation to the wealth of higher education literature that has been calling for more options and more opportunity without threatening the structure of PSE; and they portray at least one national body that is willing to address itself not just to the great problems facing America, but to the great goals of the future. (Such ideali is always likely to find a home in the PSE institutions of this country.)

The point of departure from this affirmative response, however, was in the interpretation of the stated objectives; the issues and trade-offs generated; the degree to which these objectives would impact the student's opportunity once enrolled.

Table III is included here to indicate the unquestionable acceptance of stated Commission objectives. Table I illustrates the difficulty students had in ranking these objectives and the effect of competing demands upon nine objectives with a high level of approval.

The students' response to the Commission's objectives was undoubtedly a parochial one. They understandably reacted from their frame of reference and with a preference for objectives and status quo alterations which would most likely benefit them or their particular institutions. Thus, in the priority rankings, Table I, students predictably placed the greatest emphasis upon instructional quality (1st order ranking 27 per cent), support-help in paying cost of education (1st order ranking 21 per cent), and diversity-flexibility of programs (1st order ranking 14 per cent).

A related and recurrent question from the Regional Review Sessions further illustrates the tendency to view objectives first in a personal context when students repeatedly asked, "How much of what is being discussed, how many of the objectives will become a reality before I graduate?" Only after it was established that much of the Commission effort, if approved by Congress, would benefit future generations of PSE participants did the students begin to tackle educational issues.

The implication should not be drawn, however, that the orientation of vested self-interest permeated all discussions or all surveys. The intelligence, insight, and maturity with which students discussed issues is not to be minimized.

Table I

Priority Rankings of N.C.F.P.E. Objectives

Questions 73-81:

Rank the following in order of personal preference. Fill in blanks with the numbers 1-9, use each number only once. Transfer rankings to appropriate square on answer sheet.

	1st Priority	1-2 Priority	1-2-3 Priority
Diversity-flexibility of program offerings	14%	28%	42%
Equal access for all those who desire postsecondary education	15	27	38
Opportunity-academic assistance, remedial, tutorial services	5	12	21
Accountability-efficiency and effectiveness of institution	7	18	32
Student responsibility	13	24	33
Instructional quality	27	44	58
Independence of institution	7	13	20
Student choice among program and institutional type	10	22	34
Support-help in paying cost of education	21	37	50

(Discrepancies appear due to rounding)

(Source: Survey of Student Response)

Table II

Priority Ranking of Equal Opportunity Objectives

Questions 82-84:

Rank the following in order of personal preference. Fill in blanks with the numbers 1-3, use each number only once. Transfer rankings to appropriate square on answer sheet.

	1st Priority	1-2 Priority
Student choice among program and institutional type	49%	84%
Opportunity-academic assistance, remedial, tutorial services	20	56
Equal access for all those who desire postsecondary education	29	61

(Discrepancies appear due to rounding)

(Source: Survey of Student Response)

Table III

Student Response to National PSE Objectives

	Agree	Disagree
DIVERSITY AND FLEXIBILITY		
18. Postsecondary education should offer programs with sufficient flexibility to accommodate the changing needs of individuals and society.	89%	11%
EXCELLENCE IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION		
27. Postsecondary education should strive for excellence in all instruction, research, public service and other learning opportunities.	97	3

Table III (Continued)

	Agree	Disagree
INSTITUTIONAL INDEPENDENCE		
28. Institutions of postsecondary education should have sufficient freedom and flexibility to maintain institutional and professional integrity and to meet, creatively and responsibly, their educational goals.	97%	3%
INSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY		
32. Institutions of postsecondary education should use fiscal and other resources both efficiently and effectively and employ procedures sufficient to enable funders to determine whether resources are achieving desired outcomes.	78	22
STUDENT RESPONSIBILITY		
34. Students should be responsible in maintaining progress toward a specific academic goal.	76	24
CHOICE OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION		
42. Each individual should have a reasonable choice among those institutions of postsecondary education that have accepted him for admission.	91	9
OPPORTUNITY, ONCE ENROLLED IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION		
45. Postsecondary education should make available academic assistance and counseling that will enable each individual, according to his needs, capability and motivation, to achieve his educational objectives.	95	5
ACCESS TO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION		
39. Each individual should be able to enroll in some form of postsecondary education appropriate to that person's needs, capability and motivation.	95	5
ADEQUACY OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES		
52. Adequate financial and other resources should be made available to permit the accomplishment of the objectives of diversity and flexibility, excellence, institutional independence, institutional accountability, access, choice and opportunity.	83	17

Table III (Continued)

	Agree	Disagree
RESPONSIBILITY FOR FINANCING POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION		
56. The responsibility for financing postsecondary education should be shared by a combination of public and private sources, including federal, state, and local government, and by students, parents and other concerned individuals and organizations.	87%	13%
STUDENT STATUS		
64. Students should be recognized as legal adults and receive all the rights accorded that status.	70	30
INSTITUTIONAL ROLE		
68. Research, public service and other functions are appropriate only when they are compatible with and encourage instructional quality.	73	27

(Source: Survey of Student Response)

A. The Students and Universal Access to PSE

Access-opportunity are not mutually exclusive.

Few students disagreed that access was not a needed and a worthy national goal. But not unlike their discussion of educational purposes, the student asked a more basic question, "What are we providing access to?" The suspicion here was not necessarily that students would be provided an inferior institution or a questionable opportunity, but that the students could justify access only if it was accompanied by programs of opportunity. Table II exemplifies that point. Ninety-five per cent of the students surveyed agreed that access and opportunity are significant objectives. When students were asked to prioritize the equal opportunity objectives–access, opportunity, and choice–approximately 60 per cent saw access-opportunity as 1-2 priority rankings. Access without opportunity is access in a vacuum. The goal of high participation, especially among those groups traditionally barred from the PSE experience, is a quantitative achievement unless accompanied by opportunity programs.

Universal access should not include targeted populations.

The Survey of Student Response addressed itself to the question of the ability to pay. Ninety-four per cent of those responding indicated that PSE should include those students who do not have

the ability to pay. Seventy-four per cent agreed that most student aid should continue to be need-based. Students overwhelmingly concluded that accessibility is not fulfilled if only 60 per cent of those from low-income and minority groups participate. The call for access must include a continual surveillance of need, especially in light of economic depressions that may severely affect income groupings of the postsecondary population that funds have traditionally not been targeted to.

The middle class family, for example, is caught outside the eligibility requirements of financial assistance but within the economic crunch of educational costs outdistancing the ability to pay. If more than one family member is enrolled in PSE, the difficulty is intensified.

The students, while overwhelmingly endorsing universal access, continued:

1. Unless a more realistic need analysis formula is developed which accounts for:

   a. student legal independence,

   b. divorced families,

   c. escalating educational costs, and

   d. nonexpendable capital investment,

   some populations traditionally enrolled in PSE will be barred.

2. Unless veterans' benefits account for escalating opportunity costs, the veterans population will diminish.

3. Unless financing schemes promoting accessibility account for and respond to all income populations, PSE enrollments may someday include only the traditionally targeted populations.

Universal access should not usurp resources for status quo repairs and reform.

It is common knowledge, even among students, that postsecondary education has limited financial resources. The difficult trade-offs among Commission objectives and the resounding conclusion of these surveyed that the present funding is not adequate (62 per cent) substantiate that fact. With the recognition that PSE has limited resources comes the recognition that access, an expensive proposition, is so expensive that funds will be directed away from status quo problems. The students are wondering if:

1. Access is so expensive that funds for the improvement of PSE will continue to be miniscule.

2. Access is so expensive that the call for diversity-flexibility will remain endorsed but unimplemented.

3. Access is so expensive that incentives for instructional quality will have to wait.

In short, the students are pondering the possibility that the massive expenditure for access will

ultimately be counterproductive to the quality and diversity of the PSE enterprise. If that is the case, accepting such a trade-off is unwise and probably more unjust than no access at all.

Questions to the Commission:

I. Is access without opportunity an "opportunity"?

II. Will funds directed to targeted populations secure universal access?

III. Will the financing of universal access prohibit the accomplishment of other objectives and/or other status quo demands?

B. The Student and Opportunity in American PSE

The discussion of access has already embraced the need/desirability of the objective opportunity and it was strongly suggested that the lack of opportunity could significantly impact access. Table IV lists the questions and answers to the survey which accurately display student sentiment about opportunity.

Table IV

The Objective Opportunity and the Student Response

	Agree	Disagree
45. Postsecondary education should make available academic assistance and counseling that will enable each individual, according to his needs, capability and motivation to achieve his educational objectives.	94%	6%
47. Institutions should insure that students complete a program once they are accepted.	28	72
48. Students should receive public funds to attend some form of postsecondary education even if they do not intend to complete the program.	27	73
49. High school counseling offers adequate knowledge of educational opportunities.	14	86
50. High school counseling offers adequate knowledge of employment opportunities.	14	86
51. High school education offers adequate preparation for postsecondary education.	66	34

(Source: Survey of Student Response)

Generally, the students had two predominant concerns about opportunity.

The need for opportunity is a great indictment of secondary education.

The inclusion of opportunity as a national objective for PSE can be interpreted in two distinct ways:

1. That PSE has an obligation to provide remedial programs and tutorial assistance to allow a student to compete in his/her program selection, or

2. That PSE has an obligation to do so because the educational level that preceded it was ineffective and irresponsible.

It is the latter of these two interpretations that students preferred to endorse.

Table IV indicates the general dissatisfaction with high school counseling in preparing a participant for PSE experience. Even though 66 per cent of the students surveyed concluded that high school was adequate preparation for PSE, a closer examination of the data reveals a significant finding.

Table V

Adequacy of High School Education v. Level of Personal Education

	8th Grade or less	10th Grade or less	12th Grade or less	14th Grade or less	16th Grade or less	Graduate Degree
Strongly Agree - Agree	96.0	95.0	70.1	61.1	55.4	44.1

(Source: Survey of Student Response, questions 8 and 51)

When the question (No. 51) is crossed with levels of personal education, those persons with greater levels of educational attainment value the high school experience *less*.

The position of many students in the regional review sessions was that if the Commission statement on opportunity is not prefaced or equivocated, then the Commission will be guilty of legitimizing the conditions which lead to the need for opportunity programs. If this happens, then the National Commission is perpetuating the existence of these conditions and funding programs that will shift the burden of performance to the inappropriate educational sector. To view PSE in a vacuum is a danger indeed.

Opportunity should not necessarily imply completion.

Consistent with the student stance on purposes, students were fearful that the Commission's statement of opportunity would lead to the call for completion of program offerings rather than the expansion of learning opportunities. While students do not condone the misuse of public aid, as noted in Table IV, question No. 48, they are overwhelmingly opposed to mandatory completion as implied by question No. 47, Table IV. The proper interpretation of opportunity is that a student, according to "his needs, capability, and motivation," should be afforded "academic assistance and counseling" that will enable each individual to *compete* in the program of his choice, *not complete.*

This does not mean to imply that students want to deemphasize completion, but that completion is a function of individual choice. The opportunities for participation may satisfy the thirst for knowledge.

Questions to the Commission:

I. Should the federal government increase aid to elementary and secondary education to improve the preparation and advisement of students at that level rather than provide massive opportunity programs?

II. Are completion rates a measure of a successful PSE?

III. Should the objective "opportunity" emphasize completion, competition, or both?

C. Students and Choice in American PSE

"Each individual should have a reasonable choice among those institutions of postsecondary education that have admitted him."

The National Commission's statement of the objective "choice" is rewritten here because the statement evoked considerable confusion. The confusion resulted from:

1. the inability to make a definitive judgment upon "reasonable choice,"

2. the implied contradiction that a student has choice even if a considerable number of institutions initially limit his choice for him, and

3. the general conclusion that most students consider choice only in the context of program offerings and not institutional types.

In the discussions that followed these initial observations, students also had a difficult time discussing the limits/range of reasonable choice. Students endorsed the need for a diversity of academic standards among institutions of PSE but they admitted that student choice is ultimately determined by both student and institution. The ultimate priority to most students enrolled in PSE was the flexibility, suitability, and diversity of programs. To engage in discussions of institutional choice seemed a frivolous adventure into extralegal public policy.

Student choice determines program diversity and flexibility.

With the preceding discussion in mind, a return to Table II is warranted. While access-

opportunity are indicated as the highest 1-2 priority rankings, the strong endorsement of choice is also apparent. But choice in Table II and as defined in this question from the Survey of Student Response relates to "choice among programs and institutional type." Based on extensive discussions with students, it is contended here that the discussion of choice of institution and programs, together, significantly biased specific student reaction to choice of institutions. The strength of the bias needs to be discussed further. Students contend:

1. that the student choice and (demand) of certain program offerings ultimately determines whether curriculums are diverse (i.e., without student interest and enrollments, program will collapse).

2. the extent of faculty and administration response to that choice is a function of flexibility.

The frustration of reform is that flexibility is too often considered an objective related to cost and that flexibility is presently framed in the limited context of dropping or adding curriculums and not creating new programs or revising existing ones to meet the changing needs of students.

Students may ultimately, through choice of program offerings, be the master of diversity-flexibility, but the time involved in altering the diversity or encouraging flexibility is too extensive to make noticeable gains. One strong argument for direct student aid is that institutions might be more responsive to student needs and desires if students control a larger share of PSE finances.

Institutional choice is not a high priority objective.

The limited student response to institutional choice was by no means an uninspired one. The arguments and philosophies related to choice so prevalent in the circles of American higher education were reiterated among the students. (The uniqueness of private education, the call for and need for institutional diversity, the call for performance contracting, etc.)

The majority of the students maintained:

1. The diversity of our system is manifest in the variety of program offerings and as long as that diversity expands, types of institutions are of little concern.

2. The tendency to sacrifice the private school philosophy by seeking public funds (even in the wake of financial pressures) indicates that the principles of private education are not sacred.

3. The inability to market the private philosophy even to students of high-income groupings indicates that the uniqueness of private education is in question.

4. The apparent modeling of the structures and curriculums of private institutions after public institutions denies claim to uniqueness.

5. The limited resources of PSE and the importance of opportunity, access, diversity, and accountability, relegate public aid to private institutions to a second-order priority.

6. To allow students a choice of institutions is a luxury in PSE when the needs of minority, low-income and even middle-income groups are considered.

7. Public institutions, having demonstrated the ability to educate a majority of those students in PSE, to maintain a diversity of programs, and to keep educational costs proportionately lower, are the best means to accomplish the coming era of options and opportunity.

8. PSE is a marketplace that thrives on competition. Not unlike business and industry, those who cannot compete will eventually die.

Questions to the Commission:

I. Can "reasonable choice" be defined in the context of program offerings?

II. Is the sanctity of private education, the maintenance of the diversity of institutional types, a worthwhile public goal and wise public policy?

III. Can we afford institutional choice in light of the competing demands for access and opportunity?

IV. Do enrollment patterns by institutional types necessitate the preservation of private higher education?

V. Can the National Commission fund private higher education without sacrificing the diversity of other sectors of the learning force?

D. Students and Institutional Independence

Table VI

Student Response: Institutional Independence, Control, Diversity

	Agree	Disagree
28. Institutions of postsecondary education should have sufficient freedom and flexibility to maintain institutional and professional integrity and to meet, creatively and responsibly, their educational goals.	97%	3%
29. Federal money means federal control	47	53
30. Institutions should accept federal support for diversity and flexibility of program offerings even if it means a loss of some independence.	54	46

(Source: Survey of Student Response)

Even though students, in their parochial point of view and environment, witness the use of institutional independence and degrees of autonomy daily, their perspective does not generally place importance on such independence relative to that placed by administrators and faculty. If students are faced with the prospect of a choice between greater federal control or greater curriculum development, money speaks louder than the loss of independence.

The ever-present threat of federal control is not even significantly documented by question No. 29, Table VI. Only 47 per cent of the respondents concluded "federal money means federal control."

The institutional perspective of independence is relatively unimportant to students. (See Table I)

E. The Student and Excellence in American PSE

The Survey of Student Response indicated a strong acceptance of excellence with 97 per cent agreement that excellence in research, instruction, and public service should be fostered.

Excellence in instructional quality is the priority.

Table I, "The Priority Rankings Among National Objectives," includes not the general objective "excellence" but the more specific objective "Instructional Quality." Forty-eight per cent of the students, the outstanding percentage of all objectives prioritized, concluded instructional quality is both the greatest need and one of the greatest goals PSE should respond to. In the minds of the students, instructional quality is at present not a reality and should become one:

1. to justify the rising costs of PSE tuitions,

2. to fulfil pre-PSE expectations; instructional quality would be an abundant commodity and source for intellectual stimulation, and

3. to encourage the qualitative aspects of PSE and diminish the fear of mass production of graduates.

The future of PSE rests upon quality not quantity.

The quality of administration, of planning and management, or research and public service is secondary to the quality of classroom instruction. If universal access is not met with quality offerings and instruction, access will ultimately lead to falling expectations, diminishing desire and motivation, and an inhibited development. If opportunity programs are not of a significant level of quality, they will fail to reach their objectives. If even the greatest dimension of diversity and flexibility is offered, that is not of particular benefit unless the response to changing needs is always met with a high caliber of instructional quality. And even if choice is offered to the students of American postsecondary education, that choice may not be worth the high cost unless there is no doubt that all institutions among a student's choices offer quality programs.

The variety and multiplicity of options and the expansion of opportunities may become a quantitative achievement unless accompanied by quality instruction. To the extent that students

feel "they are getting their money's worth" rests the future of PSE enrollments and, concomitantly, the future of PSE.

In the context of equal opportunity, instructional quality shoukl be emphasized.

Table VII displays the student reaction to research and their acceptance of research when it enhances instructional quality.

Table VII

The Role of Research, Instruction in PSE

	Agree	Disagree
68. Research, public service and other functions are appropriate only when they are compatible with and encourage instructional quality.	73%	27%
69. Educational institutions should remain the primary research centers in the U.S.	72	28

(Source: Survey of Student Response)

The apparent conclusion that can be drawn is that while research should continue to play an important role in PSE, the preferred *emphasis* is upon research utilized for instruction and instructional quality. The students in the Regional Review Sessions endorsed the belief that PSE cannot afford *not* to emphasize instructional quality even if it means a significant decline in research funds. Maximizing opportunity requires not only entry and exposure but an exposure that will encourage quality performance and enhance the motivation of the undergraduate. Students refused to accept the cliche "the scholar is the best teacher and the teacher is the best scholar." The relationship is a strained one in their experience if not a coincidental one.

In light of these responses the students suggested:

1. that if institutional grants should be made available, the encouragement of instructional quality should serve as the major criterion for disbursement, and

b. that the possibility of requiring national standards for certification of PSE instruction should be explored.

Questions to the Commission:

I. Can instructional quality be encouraged without deemphasizing the role and scope to research?

II. Should funds for the improvement of undergraduate instruction not accompany funding schemes aimed at universal access and opportunity?

F. Students and Student Responsibility

The calls for student responsibility, particularly from taxpayers and legislators, may be warranted when the growing default rate of loans is viewed or if completion rates are considered to be ultimately determined by student responsibility. Both the Survey and the Review Sessions indicated that students feel a profound responsibility for the use of public funds and for making progress towards academic goals. Table VIII relates student reaction to academic and financial responsibility.

Table VIII

Student and Academic, Financial Responsibility

	Agree	Disagree
ACADEMIC		
34. Students should be responsible in maintaining progress toward a specific academic goal.	76%	24%
35. Students should have to maintain a minimum grade point average.	76	24
FINANCIAL		
61. Students should pay a share of the cost of their education.	91	9
59. Student loans would be preferable to parental contributions.	47	53
60. Loan repayment is an unfair burden on student income after graduation.	35	65
38. If students fail to find employment after graduation, they would be justified in applying for suspension or cancellation of any educational loans.	51	49

(Source: Survey of Student Response)

Students hold themselves accountable for academic performance.

While students consistently demonstrated an antagonism towards "forced completion," questions 34 and 35 in Table VIII indicate a willingness to maintain progress towards academic goals and even maintain a minimum grade point average appropriate to that student's desires, capabilities and motivation. In short, students are the best judge of their individual performance levels. To the extent that the call for student responsibility is taken to an extreme (i.e., forced completion, compulsory attendance, required grade point average, course requirements) students are less willing to accept a delineation of responsibility that is not of their own formulation.

Students are willing to share the responsibility of PSE as long as extenuating and burdensome conditions are considered.

Ninety-one per cent of the students surveyed, and an equally significant number of the participants in the review sessions, were willing to share the cost of PSE (Table VIII, question No. 61). Without discussing "a reasonable share" in the context, the assumption that students would overwhelmingly request payment by other sources simply is not true.

The extent to which students are willing to share the cost is a function of:

1. the ability to pay,

2. the cost of the education, and

3. the "reasonableness" of financial assistance.

Students throughout the country cannot discuss responsibility without noting that latter function. The contention is that depressive market conditions may not be accounted for in financial assistance programs. The ability to repay loans that do not consider income *upon* graduation or reasonable repayment schedules is to be particularly cited here.

While only 35 per cent of those surveyed thought loan repayment was an unfair burden upon graduation (Table VIII, question No. 60), 51 per cent of the students noted that there may be extenuating circumstances that would necessitate cancellation or suspension of loans (Table VIII, question No. 38). In such circumstances, loan repayment should not be viewed as a function of student responsibility but in terms of the inadequacy of present loan programs to anticipate these conditions.

The call for student responsibility in a one-sided triangle.

If the call for student responsibility is a just one, a call for faculty and administrative responsibility must also be included. The long unheeded call by students for institutional responsibility is particularly pertinent. When students were asked whether: "32. Institutions are presently using resources efficiently and effectively." 52 per cent of the respondents *disagreed.*

Questions to the Commission:

I. Is loan repayment that is not based on the anticipated ability to pay upon graduation a function of student responsibility?

II. Why is the call for institutional accountability not seen from the student perspective?

III. Why are the great majority of responsible students categorized as irresponsible because of the actions of a few?

G. Students and Institutional Accountability

The objectives of institutional accountability and choice suffered the same fate when confronted by the students. An alternative interpretation was offered rather than the discussion of specific Commission intent. The students agreed that cost standards and analytical structures that yield superior planning and management were not sufficient if students are unable to hold the institution accountable. Thus the Commission statement of the objective on accountability:

> Institutions of Postsecondary Education should use fiscal and other resources both efficiently and effectively and employ procedures sufficient to enable funders to determine whether resources are achieving desired outcomes.

was emphatically interpreted by the students to mean that students, as the primary funders of PSE institutions, should, in harmony with other constituents and funders, develop accountability mechanisms to insure that institutions respond to the consumer needs.

The justification for such an extreme interpretation lies in the fact students have heretofore been neglected in institutional decision making and have generally had little to say about the allocation of institutional resources. If students have no means of holding institutions accountable, they should be heard and permitted participation on governing boards, at bargaining tables, and in evaluation of faculty.

The Survey demonstrates the extent to which students question institutional resource allocation and use. Fifty-two per cent of the respondents did not see the wise use or allocation at present.

Student reaction and response to accountability followed this pattern:

1. Do mechanisms presently exist that allow students to influence resource allocation?
2. If so, what are they?
3. If not, why not?
4. If not, what mechanisms can be developed?

Present student accountability mechanisms are scant and ineffective.

A recently published report and survey, "Student Participation on Institutional Governing Boards," conducted by the American Council of Education (October, 1972), notes that only 14.3 per cent of the institutions surveyed had made provision for student membership on boards of control. Of the 2,189 institutions responding, 62.6 per cent had not considered or had considered and had denied student participation. This evidence suggests that the prevalent assumption that students are making enormous gains in institutional governance is false. Student participation is

scant in institutions of higher education and there are strong indications that participation is even less in proprietary and vocational-technical schools.

A second predominant example of the student accountability mechanism was the student-teacher evaluation. While many are in use throughout the country, their validity is often questioned as too subjective or not subjective enough or, at least, not a valid combination of subjective/objective, but regardless of the motive of the evaluation:

1. few are used directly for institutional decision-making,

2. few are used as prime determinants for the hiring or firing of faculty, and

3. few are accepted, even among students, as an effective mechanism for change.

Third, the consumer philosophy which encompasses the demand function of students was cited. The philosophy, often used at small, generally private institutions where student fees support a substantial percentage of educational costs, utilizes the purchasing power of the students, the collective power of the purse, as a power that cannot be ignored by those governing the institutions. The demands of students for curriculum reform, moderate tuition, and participation are pitted against the institution's need to retain students and fee payments and establish tuition levels consistent with educational cost factors. The acceptance of this philosophy is limited because of the dependence upon percentage of educational costs paid by students. The effectiveness of this mechanism is wholly dependent upon the ability to muster collective student support in the face of possible severe economic consequences.

Other student alternatives included collective bargaining, lobbying, and student unionization, but they are in most cases in the stage of unproven infancy.

The essence of the discussion of student accountability is the extent to which students are afforded equal status with other constituent groups. Eighty-eight per cent of those students in the survey enrolled in four-year programs concluded that students should be recognized as legal adults and receive all the rights accorded that status. The sense of student inferiority permeates much of American postsecondary education today. The need for students to participate in institutional decision-making is superceded only by their right to do so.

Alternative student accountability mechanisms are being considered.

Some major trends in student action across the country include the consideration of the following measures:

1. a renewal effort to gain greater participation and voting privileges for students in governing boards, coordinating agencies, academic senates and administrative planning forces,

2. the unionization of students and use of student fees and other support to seek desired change and outcomes,

3. the inclusion of students in the collective bargaining process,

4. the intensification of student lobbying in an attempt to gain educational reforms that will benefit all students, state-wide as well as nationally.

H. Students and Diversity-Flexibility

The intention of this discussion of diversity and flexibility is to further explain the intense support students of American postsecondary education have for this objective. The previous discussion of "Purposes" and "Choice" addressed much of the logic of the students in this regard. Table IX displays all the questions within the Survey of Student Response which address diversity and the students' agreement/disagreement.

Table IX

Questions Relating to the Diversity, Flexibility of Program Offerings

	Agree	Disagree
18. Postsecondary education should offer programs with sufficient flexibility to accommodate the changing needs of individuals and society.	89%	11%
19. The present curriculums should be designed to make the graduate more employable.	83	17
20. Postsecondary education is presently flexible and responsive to individual needs.	—	—
21. Institutions should keep program offerings up to date.	92	8
22. Institutions should keep program offerings up to date even if it means higher tuition.	83	17
24. Present internship programs are adequate.	51	49
23. On-the-job training or internship programs make education more valuable.	83	17
25. Programs should be structured to meet specific manpower requirements of society.	65	35
26. Programs should be structured with the flexibility to "drop-in" and "drop-out."	—	—
30. Institutions should accept federal support for diversity and flexibility of program offerings even if it means a loss of some independence.	54	46

(Source: Survey of Student Response)

The endorsement of diversity-flexibility.

Table IX indicates (1) an overwhelming endorsement of diversity-flexibility as a national objective for PSE, and (2) the obvious need for diversity and flexibility with particular emphasis upon employment-oriented programs and the flexibility from traditional lock-step curriculums.

If the objective of diversity-flexibility is examined in the context of all other objectives, the students of American postsecondary education seem to be saying:

1. Do not allow a significant diversion of funds away from diversity. If that occurs, the merits of access-opportunity come into question.

2. Give us opportunities but not opportunities without options and flexibility to choose among those options.

3. Design a host of programs to meet the needs of individuals but not at the expense of the needs of society.

4. The type of institution that the program is offered in is unimportant. If the program is suitable for me and society and if instructional quality is exhibited in the delivery of course content, the course has merit.

5. If programs are developed only at the expense of other programs, if institutions refuse the challenge of innovation by funding popular existing programs instead of creating alternative options, then PSE is stifling innovation and diversity and flexibility will be steeped in tradition.

6. Diversity-flexibility must be viewed outside of the context of cost. Diversity does not always require the proliferation of costly programs.

Diversity and flexibility is the "pivotal objective."

The acceptance and importance of this objective to the students of American postsecondary education presents some significant issues. If access-opportunity is not met with diversity-flexibility, the system and the students' acceptance of the system is thrown into imbalance. If diversity-flexibility is not accompanied by instructional quality, options are less attractive and less responsive to students' needs. If students do not actively participate in the academic decision making, "presumed responsiveness" will result and diversity-flexibility is likely to suffer the same fate. This objective is certainly a pivotal one in the eyes of the student. Without its achievement, all other objectives seem insignificant.

PRESENT PROGRAMS & ALTERNATIVE SCHEMES

Status Quo Programs

It becomes increasingly apparent that the discussion with students of present "funding" programs was a discussion of present student "aid" programs. It is in that light that the students are vocal on two primary issues:

1. adequacy of funding, and
2. responsibility of support ("who should pay?").

Within this framework, two contentions are made:

1. present financial aid programs are not congruent, and
2. present financial aid programs are not consistent.

In addressing *adequacy*, students were quick to point out several *inadequacies*. The most predominant was the insufficient dollar amounts most aid programs afforded in contrast to the total cost of education. All programs that do not account or provide for subsistence costs are unrealistic. Coupled with the ever-increasing opportunity costs, grants and scholarships provide only a small percentage of the total cost of PSE. Furthermore, status quo programs fail to account for the *rising* costs of both *tuition* and *subsistence*. In fact, fluctuation of appropriations to various aid programs makes it difficult, if not impossible, to anticipate the availability of aid. Not unrelated, students are calling for a more realistic need analysis, one which truly reflects the parents' and/or student's ability to pay. As Table II indicates, the middle income "crunch" is indeed a reality.

Although loans are usually cited as an "aid" program, students feel that loan repayment should reflect the same "ability to pay" principle that forced them to take out the loans. Students do not condone default, but readily recognize the possibility of extenuating economic conditions after graduation that inhibit.repayment.

Although the students agreed that financial needs should be the prime criteria for determination of financial aid, students noted an inadequacy in scholarship programs. Not only does the indictment of insufficient monies apply, the number of scholarships available is grossly inadequate.

Finally, and perhaps most significantly, students from all sectors of PSE who had dealt with financial aid, indicated a lack of knowledge of many of the available programs, an impatience with and confusion about the application process.

As both the survey and student review sessions illustrated, a multiple-funding structure is the most desirable; a funding structure, however, with a mix differing from the status quo. Students did not object to parental and/or student contributions. What they did object to, however, was the inordinate amount provided for *total* costs by these two sources. It was deemed appropriate that the additional costs to improve and expand PSE be incurred by the federal government.

Alternative Funding Proposals

In the view of students, any proposals for student aid should address the problems of congruency and continuity, a unified approach with an anticipated appropriation. Because students agree with Commission objectives, because students feel that present funding is inadequate and because a multiple-funding structure is desirable, several alternatives, or a combination of them, could theoretically meet these needs:

Voucher Plan Grants

A unified grant program directed neither toward nor away from present target populations, but to include a significant portion of the project "exclusion" group, is essential. Such a grant program, based primarily on realistic need, must provide for a substantial part of the total costs of PSE.

Income - Contingent Loans

Loans should be made available to expand the horizons of choice and better meet *individual* needs. Such a loan program should have primary emphasis on a flexible repayment schedule in terms of both time and amount. Loans should be structured to avoid overburdening students upon completion.

State Scholarship Programs

Incentives should be provided to encourage state governments to formulate and adequately fund scholarships. An extensive scholarship program would not only enhance choice but also allow access on the basis of academic ability.

Realistic Need Analysis

Need analysis should accurately reflect, as the name implies, need. Students feel that present need accounting does not, in fact, accurately indicate the ability to pay. The expected large parental contribution of the middle-income families is *not* realistic. Calculating the average rate of return of capital investments and adding it to net taxable income is *not* realistic. Assuming a standard student contribution is *not* realistic.

Expansion of Improvement Programs

The overwhelming student support for improvement of PSE and the Commission objectives, the realization that improvements must accompany expansion, and the institutional struggle for survival in light of declining enrollments, all clearly illustrate the need for diversity, flexibility, and innovation. Institutions of PSE must be allowed the chance (and perhaps be goaded into it) to develop new classes, curriculum, and programs. The present Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, funded at $10 million in FY 73, is not enough to insure or even facilitate the need for improvement.

Institutional Block Grants for Opportunity

As expanded grant programs may provide additional access, so must funding schemes be developed to supplement the new access with opportunity. Expensive, but important, opportunity

programs will answer the question, "What do I do after I'm accepted?"

Institutional Block Grants for Instructional Quality

The concept of PSE as endorsed by the Commission is providing an educational experience to those who participate–the emphasis is on learning. This concept, as defined by students, requires instructional quality. To ease the competition for research monies, institutional grants are a necessity, not a luxury.

The discussion of status quo programs and alternative funding schemes with students occurred in a piecemeal fashion. The suggesting alternatives are not intended to be comprehensive nor do we pretend they are sophisticated in nature; it would take a professional staff to meet either or both of those criteria. Students were simply relating problems as they encountered them and solutions as they perceived them.

Table I

Adequacy, Responsibility for Funding PSE

	Agree	Disagree
ADEQUACY OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES		
52. Adequate financial and other resources should be made available to permit the accomplishment of the objectives of diversity and flexibility, excellence, institutional independence, institutional accountability, access, choice and opportunity.	84%	16%
53. The present funding structure is adequate.	39	61
54. Present financial aid programs are difficult to understand and the application process is complicated.	61	39
RESPONSIBILITY FOR FINANCING POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION		
56. The responsibility for financing postsecondary education should be shared by a combination of public and private sources, including federal, state, and local government, and by students, parents and other concerned individuals and organizations.	87%	13%
57. Parents should be considered as a source of financing postsecondary education.	58	42
58. If parents contributed to postsecondary education, it would be difficult to be independent.	---	---

Table I (Continued)

		Agree	Disagree
59.	Student loans would be preferable to parental contributions	47%	53%
60	Loan repayment is an unfair burden on student income after graduation.	35	65
61.	Students should pay a share of the cost of their education.	91	9
63.	Postsecondary education should derive its primary financial support from:		

$2,000 Yearly Tuition Costs	0) Parents	14%
	1) Students	15%
	2) Federal government	47%
	3) State government	20%
	4) Local government	0%

(Source: Survey of Student Response)

Table II

"The present funding structure is adequate."

Parental Income	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
less than $6,000	54.7
$6,000 – $9,999	44.2
$10,000 – $14,999	25.0
$15,000 – $20,000	33.5
greater than $20,000	34.4

"The responsibility for financing postsecondary education should be shared by a combination of public and private sources, including federal, state, and local government, and by students, parents and other concerned individuals and organizations."

Parental Income	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
below $6,000	79.8
$6,000 – $9,999	86.4
$10,000 – $14,999	92.6
$15,000 – $20,000	90.1
greater than $20,000	84.2

Table II (Continued)

"Parents should be considered as a source of financing postsecondary education."

Primary Source of Support	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
Personal Income	50.8
Parents	74.8
Loans	53.6
Federal Grants	38.8
State Grants	35.9
Institutional Scholarships	54.5
Work-Study	52.9
Other	69.4

"Students should pay a share of the cost of their education."

Parental Income	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
less than $6,000	88.8
$6,000 – $9,999	91.4
$10,000 – $14,999	94.1
$15,000 – $20,000	93.2
greater than $20,000	84.3

"Postsecondary education should derive its primary financial support from:"

Parental Income	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
less than $5,000	28.8
$6,000 – $9,999	22.6
$10,000 – $14,999	6.0
$15,000 – $20,000	20.4
greater than $20,000	19.5

"Student loans would be preferable to parental contributions."

Parental Income	Percentage who strongly agree or agree
less than $6,000	42.3
$6,000 – $9,999	46.9
$10,000 – $14,999	53.1
$15,000 – $20,000	47.5
greater than $20,000	40.6

ISSUES AND ANSWERS

The Student Response to Fifteen Issues Affecting PSE and the National Commission

The following questions were supplied by the Commission document, "Objectives of Postsecondary Education and Related Policy Issues," (May, 1973). These issues represent not only a Commission concern but the concern of all members of postsecondary education. Consequently, the student response to these issues will be displayed here.

Issue 1

1. *Should each individual, regardless of age, sex, income, ethnic background, or prior educational experience or certification, be able to attend some form of postsecondary education?*

Response: The students' overwhelming response was a positive one. Access was considered to be a great national goal which can only be accomplished if other barriers besides the financial one are eliminated. Sex discrimination is a significant barrier that can be eradicated only as society responds adequately to the call for gainful employment opportunities for women. Minority and low-income participation is less a function of eliminating financial barriers and more a function of eliminating other significant socio-economic and cultural barriers (i.e. attitudes, traditions, etc.). Access to those regardless of prior educational experience or certification requires a reexamination of the merits of credentialism and a realization that previous educational experience is not the only determinant to successful participation in PSE. The elimination of barriers as related to age requires a substantive reevaluation of attitudes; the attitude that college is only for the 18-24 age grouping, the attitude that learning stops upon completion of the PSE experience and the attitude that attendance by those outside the traditional college-age grouping will require major curriculum revisions.

Issue 2

2. *Is it in the national interest to increase access to PSE as defined by question one?*

Response: Yes, but to the extent that enormous amounts of funds for access necessitate a diversion of funds from the present efforts to achieve diversity-flexibility-innovation and instructional quality, limitations to access may at this time be warranted. Even with limited resources, the expansion of opportunity should not be done at the expense of options, innovation, or other needed status quo repairs.

Issue 3

3. *Should adequacy of financial assistance be determined by (1) total cost, (2) absolute cost, or (3) relative costs?*

Response: Total costs. The escalating tuition costs and costs of living must be considered in the delineation of need. Foregone income should be considered as a prime determinant of enrollment, especially as employment opportunities diminish in response to market conditions. The call for "opportunity costs" is widespread. To accomplish universal access, subsistency costs and foregone

income must be considered. The payment of tuition alone may not accomplish the goal of access. To the extent that "choice" is funded, relative need consideration must replace present need analysis formulas.

Issue 4

4. *Should the appropriate form of postsecondary education be determined by (1) cost, (2) the individual, or (3) testing?*

Response: The individual. Cost will ultimately determine accessibility to *appropriate* forms of PSE based on the student's ability to pay and the extent to which the access funds allow a choice among a range of institutions and a range of costs. However, the level of funding should allow some choice and not relegate the *appropriate* form to low-cost, low-quality education. For access and opportunity funds to succeed, the student must be able to determine the appropriate form of PSE consistent with his/her needs, capabilities, and motivation.

Issue 5

5. *Should the appropriate form of PSE be limited to public institutions?*

Response: No. The voucher system should be employed for the distribution of most financial assistance to students. The choice of institution should include alternatives, both public and private. To the extent that assistance programs do not pay the total cost of tuition, public or private, a combination of other funding sources should be made available to implement student choice. To the extent that public funds for opportunity programs are dispersed to public institutions, the appropriate form of PSE in many cases would be in the public sector. Financial assistance need not eliminate the private sector if those funds, as they should be, are in the form of student, not institutional, aid.

Issue 6

6. *What is the likelihood in the near future that many individuals in the dependent age group may be at least legally independent of their parents?*

Response: While no statistical evidence is available to document the extent of students seeking legal independence, the number of recent court cases in this area and the obvious desire of students for legal and financial independence seems to indicate a strong likelihood that students in large numbers will be declaring independence. The impact of such an occurrence upon present financial assistance programs would be enormous. Contingency plans should be developed in all haste to account for the "happening." As recent court decisions indicate, the legal independence of the student is not a question of "can they?" but a question of "when will they?"

Issue 7

7. *How do administrative policies and procedures for delivery of financial aid to the student affect access?*

Response: There is no doubt that the limited dissemination of information about financial assistance inhibits a great deal of access. Students do not decide to enroll in PSE and then assume

financial assistance is available. If educational institutions at all levels do not publicize the opportunities available, a significant number of students will be denied access through ignorance; ignorance of students for not knowing and the ignorance of those involved in the distribution of financial assistance for not properly deploying the information. Furthermore, if those students receiving financial assistance are not informed of the levels of appropriation on a continuing basis and if there is no continuity of yearly appropriations, those who have gained access may lose it. If efforts are not made to distribute financial aid information to students (through radio, television, institutions or in public places, etc.), access will be denied to a significant number of students. Even the current extensive attempts to explain the BEOG program are inadequate.

Issue 8

8. *Should institutions of PSE insure that a student completes the program in which he is enrolled?*

Response: No. Seventy-two per cent of those students surveyed said no. Institutions of postsecondary education should insure that students have a diversity of program offerings and insure that a great flexibility of learning opportunities exists. Students will responsibly make progress toward an academic goal appropriate to that student's needs, capabilities and desires; but that does not necessarily require completion. If the notion that learning is a life-long process is accepted, completion is an arbitrary and inappropriate expectation. Such expectations perpetuate the elitist nature of credentialism.

Issue 9

9. *Should institutions of PSE be required to set up opportunity programs if "access" is fully funded?*

Response: Yes. To have one without the other is to minimize opportunity. Students must have access to opportunity programs to insure that students can compete in the program of their choice. Even if limited resources require that fewer students gain access, it is justified.

Issue 10

10. *Should students who do not qualify academically for entrance be accepted for enrollment in all types of postsecondary education if remedial programs are not available in the institutions of their choice?*

Response: There is not a clear dichotomy of response here. On one hand, students should not be denied admission on the condition that they will require remedial programs and the institution of their choice does not provide them. There is a questionable accuracy in attempting to predict performance.. On the other hand, open admissions to students requiring remedial programs and not receiving them, may be counterproductive.

Issue 11

11. *Should "opportunity" be funded fully before funds are released for "choice?"*

Response: Yes. "Choice" should be classified as an unaffordable luxury until access-opportunity

can be reasonably achieved. This should not preclude the maintenance of a variety and multiplicity of program offerings. Full funding of access-opportunity should not eliminate options and should not prohibit the accomplishment of diversity-flexibility.

Issue 12

12. Should we utilize more than just public institutions to achieve public goals in PSE?

Response: Yes. To forward educational purposes to accomplish national objectives and to shape national goals, all resources should be employed. The benefits of PSE should not be viewed from a private-public perspective but from an industrywide perspective. However, to the extent that the accomplishment of public objectives presents severe intersegmental cost differentials, the least expensive alternative should be chosen. It is a questionable assumption, however, that the accomplishment of national objectives in the private sector is necessarily more expensive. The mere existence of the private sector extends more options to all participants. The use of performance contracting in the private sector should be a welcome addition to income. The use of voucher plans may retain the private sector and concommitantly retain choice.

Issue 13

13. What standards of educational attainment should be required of students to retain their financial assistance?

Response: If the Commission endorses the statement, "Students should be responsible in maintaining progress towards a specific academic goal" appropriate to the student's capabilities, needs, and motivation, no national standards for educational attainment need to be established. Student aid should require that the student adhere to the academic standards of the institution of his/her choice. External standards are thought to be unwise and unfair. They may unwisely emphasize completion, and perpetuate the existence of present lock-step structures. They may unfairly require schedules of programs that cannot be met by student performance or ability.

Issue 14

14. Should some external agent monitor institutional tuition increases?

Response: Yes. The question implies a solution to what students see as irresponsible and unjustifiable cost increases. The external agent could serve two distinct purposes:

(1) to study and compile tuition information and forward such information, when appropriate, to legislative bodies to provide an objective view of financial distress and determine what, if any, national or statewide policy can be developed to eliminate such distress, and

(2) to study the justifications, if any, for tuition hikes and forward conclusion to funders for their scrutiny.

Issue 15

15. Should institutions be held accountable for the subsequent employment of students?

Response: No. While the call for occupationally oriented programs is great, while the employ-

ability of graduates is in question, it is not necessarily the purpose of institutions to place their students in the occupational marketplace (although some have assumed that responsibility). More adequate manpower predictions and counseling, and more occupationally oriented curriculums is the reasonable degree of institutional responsibility in this regard.

It is noteworthy, however, that subsequent employment of graduates in the field of their choice should be one measure of institutional quality.

ORIGINAL BUDGETARY PROPOSAL

Review of Student Response

June 4, 1973

The budget proposal is an approximation, but appropriations larger than this request are unlikely.

Direct Additional Expense (as estimated by Commissioner Engen)

Commissioner Travel Expenses (Food, Lodging, Transportation) for the four regional sessions	$1,000
Assistant Coordinator Travel Expenses (including accumulated advance time)	1,200
Materials, Phone, Office Supplies, Etc.	200
Miscellaneous Preparation and Research of Final Paper	100
Subtotal	$2,500

Student Participant Travel (staff estimation)*

20 participants x 4 meetings	
80 participants @ $350	$2,800

Induced Staff Expense (staff estimation)

Logistical Support Salaries	$1,000
Travel	1,500
Overall Total Expense	$7,800

A separate account will be established and maintained by the Commission's financial secretary and monthly financial and progress reports will be available to the Commission.

*Student Participant Travel Budget deleted in approved budget.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Review of Student Response

October 31, 1973

Direct Additional Expense

Commissioner Travel Expense (Food, Lodging, Transportation) for the (15) fifteen regional sessions and preparation of final report	$1,685*
Research Coordinator Travel Expenses (including travel for final preparations and presentation of report)	506*
Administrative Supplies (mailing costs, materials, phone, office supplies)	125
Staff Support (typing, logistical support salaries)	85
Preparation of Final Report	200*
Computer Costs (survey results)	650*
Commission Salary - Consultant Fees	483
Printing - Survey	400*
Estimated total expenditures as of October 31, 1973	$4,134

*Denotes Commissioner approximations as all expenses have as of yet not been computed. As of October 31, 1973, none of these approximations seem unrealistic and appropriations larger than these figures are unlikely.

APPENDIX

Appendix I-1

The National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education

THE CONGRESSIONAL CHARGE TO THE COMMISSION

The National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education was established by Congress in Public Law 92-318 (Section 141) and appointed by Congress and the President to undertake studies of:

The impact of past, present, and anticipated private, local, state and federal support for postsecondary education.

The appropriate role of the states in support of higher education (including the application of state law upon postsecondary educational opportunities).

Alternative student assistance programs.

The potential federal, state and private participation in such programs.

The establishing legislation does not leave entirely to the Commission the task of delineating details of the study, but goes on to indicate several specifics that shall be included and shall be considered:

1. The study shall determine the need, the desirability, the form, and the level of additional governmental and private assistance to postsecondary education.

2. It shall include at least:

   a. An analysis of the existing programs of aid to institutions of higher education.

   b. An analysis of various alternative proposals presented to the Congress to provide assistance to institutions of higher education.

   c. An analysis of other viable alternatives of assistance to institutions of higher education.

3. The analyses under No. 2 shall include:

   a. The costs.

   b. The advantages and disadvantages.

   c. The extent to which each proposal would preserve the diversity and independence of such institutions.

d. The extent to which each would advance the national goal of making postsecondary education accessible to all individuals, including returning veterans, having the desire and ability to continue their education.

4. In conducting the study, the Commission shall consider:

a. the nature and causes of serious financial distress facing institutions of postsecondary education; and

b. alternative models for the long-range solutions to the problems of financing postsecondary education with special attention to the potential federal, state, local and private participation in such programs, including, at least:

(1) the assessment of previous related private and governmental studies and their recommendations;

(2) existing state and local programs of aid to postsecondary institutions;

(3) the level of endowment, private sector support, and other incomes of postsecondary institutions and the feasibility of federal and state income tax credits for charitable contributions to postsecondary institutions;

(4) the level of federal support of postsecondary institutions through such programs as research grants and other general and categorical programs;

(5) alternative forms of student assistance, including, at least, loan programs based on income-contingent lending, loan programs which utilize fixed, graduated repayment schedules, loan programs which provide for cancellation or deferment of all or part of repayment in any given year based on a certain level of a borrower's income; and existing student assistance programs including those administered by the Office of Education, the Social Security Administration, the Public Health Service, the National Science Foundation, and the Veterans Administration; and

(6) suggested national uniform standards for determining the annual per-student costs of providing postsecondary education for students in attendance at various types and classes of institutions of higher education.

The legislation requires that "No later than April 30, 1973, [to be amended to December 31, 1973] the Commission shall make a final report to the **President and Congress** [emphasis added] on the results of the investigation and study." The report will include:

1. Findings and recommendations as the Commission deems appropriate, including recommendations for legislation.

2. Suggested national uniform standard procedures for determining the annual per-student costs of providing postsecondary education for students in attendance at various types and classes of institutions for higher education.

Within 60 days from the submission of the final report,

> . . . the Commissioner [of Education] shall make a report to the Congress commenting on the Commission's suggested national uniform standards, and incorporating his recommendations with respect to national uniform standards together with any related recommendations for legislation.

In response to the charge contained in the establishing legislation, the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education will prepare:

I. A description of the present conditions that are relevant to the role of postsecondary education in our society.

II. A summary of the purposes, scope, and dimensions of postsecondary education

III. A synthesis of objectives for postsecondary education recommended by the Commission.

IV. A description of and a rationale for the selection of the measures used to evaluate the accomplishment of the objectives.

V. An analysis that describes the kind and amount of financial support for postsecondary education from all sources.

VI. A program analysis of existing funding programs.

VII. A projective analysis estimating the extent to which each of several alternative funding programs would achieve the objectives for postsecondary education agreed upon by the Commission.

VIII. Recommendations for national uniform procedures for calculating instructional costs per student.

IX. An assessment of the nature and causes of serious financial distress facing postsecondary institutions and recommendations for improvement.

X. The final reports of findings and recommendations.

DEFINITION OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION April 13, 1973

The CDE committee proposes that the Commission adopt for its analytical effort the following basic working definition of postsecondary education:

Postsecondary education consists of formal instruction, research, public service, and other learning opportunities offered by educational institutions that primarily serve persons who have completed secondary education or who are beyond the compulsory school attendance age and that are accredited by agencies officially recognized for that purpose by the U.S. Office of Education or are otherwise eligible to participate in federal programs.

The Commission believes that the nation's current postsecondary enterprise needs to be broadened to address the needs of our diverse society. However, considering the constraint of time, the limited data available, and the requirements of the legislation for specific kinds of analytical study, the Commission adopts the above definition for its basic analytical effort.

The Commission also recognizes that analysis of the breadth and scope of postsecondary education beyond this basic core, where feasible, would be beneficial to the Commission's deliberations and to the general understanding of the public concerning the total dimensions of postsecondary education. With this in mind, the Commission has directed its staff to obtain information and to conduct analysis where possible beyond the basic core defined above.

OBJECTIVES FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION Revised: October 23, 1973

1. *Student Access*

   Each individual should be able to enroll in some form of postsecondary education appropriate to that person's needs, capability, and motivation.

2. *Student Choice*

   Each individual should have a reasonable choice among those institutions of postsecondary education that have accepted him or her for admission.

3. *Student Opportunity*

   Postsecondary education should make available academic assistance and counseling that will enable each individual, according to his or her needs, capability, and motivation, to achieve according to his or her educational objectives.

4. *Institutional Diversity*

   Postsecondary education should offer programs of formal instruction and other learning opportunities and engage in research and public service of sufficient diversity to be responsive to the changing needs of individuals and society.

5. *Institutional Excellence*

   Postsecondary education should strive for excellence in all instruction and other learning opportunities, and in research and public service.

6. *Institutional Independence*

   Institutions of postsecondary education should have sufficient freedom and flexibility to maintain institutional and professional integrity and to meet creatively and responsively their educational goals.

7. *Institutional Accountability*

Institutions of postsecondary education should use financial and other resources efficiently and effectively and employ procedures that enable funders to determine whether resources are being used to achieve desired outcomes.

8. *Adequacy of Financial Resources*

Adequate financial resources should be made available for the accomplishment of these objectives through a sharing of responsibility by public and private sources, including federal, state, and local government, students and their families, and other concerned organizations and individuals.

NATIONAL COMMISSION on the FINANCING of POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Donald E. Leonard,
Chairman
Marian W. La Follette,
Vice Chairman
Senator J. Glenn Beall, Jr.
Ernest L. Boyer
Congressman John Brademas
Congressman John Dellenback
Governor Winfield Dunn
Tim R. Engen
George Kaludis
Dan M. Martin
Walter C. Mercer
Peter P. Muirhead
Senator Claiborne Pell
John W. Porter
Louis P. Rodriguez
Sister Jane Scully
Ruth C. Silva

To All Students in American Postsecondary Education:

As an independent project of the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, we are seeking your response to key issues in education that confront all post-secondary education students and institutions today. The work of the National Commission may have a significant effect on American Postsecondary Education in the immediate future.

If you as a student are concerned about:

1. soaring educational costs
2. adequate funding for your educational experience
3. the desirability of student loans
4. effectiveness of present student aid programs
5. the availability of Federal monies
6. the diversity and flexibility of curriculums
7. reasonable choice among program offerings, and
8. the quality of instruction

please fill out this survey and return it in the enclosed self-addressed envelope immediately! (Deadline October 5, 1973).

You have the unusual opportunity to provide direct input to decision-making at the national level that affects you. Your response to this survey is essential if the interests of students are to be heard and dealt with effectively at the national level.

Sincerely,

Tim R. Engen
Student Commissioner
National Commission on the
Financing of Postsecondary Education

n Lawrence, *Executive Director*,
ice of the Chairman
12 Court Place, Suite 750
nver, Colorado 80202
3) 837-2461

George Weathersby, *Associate Director*,
Office of Research
1030 15th St., N.W., Suite 1060
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 254-8137

Name of institution _____

1. Sex
   0) male
   1) female

2. Race
   0) Black
   1) Native American
   2) Oriental
   3) White
   4) Spanish-Surnamed
   5) Other

3. Religion
   0) Protestant
   1) Catholic
   2) Jewish
   3) Other
   4) None

4. Parental income
   0) less than $6,000
   1) $6,000–$9,999
   2) $10,000–$14,999
   3) $15,000–$20,000
   4) greater than $20,000

5. Father's education
   0) 1-3 years high school or less
   1) high school graduate
   2) 1-3 years postsecondary
   3) B.A. or postgraduate degree

6. Mother's education
   0) 1-3 years high school or less
   1) high school graduate
   2) 1-3 years postsecondary
   3) B.A. or postgraduate degree

7. Personal income
   0) less than $1,000
   1) $1,000–$1,999
   2) $2,000–$4,999
   3) $5,000–$10,000
   4) greater than $10,000

8. Personal Education
   0) 8th grade or less
   1) 10th grade or less
   2) 12th grade or less
   3) 14th grade or less
   4) 16th grade or less
   5) graduate degree

9. High school grade point average
   0) C and below
   1) B-, C+
   2) B+, B
   3) A, A-

10. Present grade point average
    0) C and below
    1) B-, C+
    2) B+, B
    3) A, A-

11. Field of study
    0) vocation-technical
    1) business
    2) social science
    3) humanities
    4) fine arts
    5) education/social welfare
    6) engineering
    7) health
    8) natural sciences
    9) other (specify _____)

12. Year in postsecondary education
    0) entered in 1973
    1) entered in 1972
    2) entered in 1971
    3) entered in 1970

13. Length of program
    0) 1 year or less
    1) 2 years
    2) 3 years
    3) 4 years
    4) more than 4 years

14. Presently enrolled in
    0) 1 institution
    1) 2 or more institutions

15. One year tuition costs
    0) below $250
    1) $250–$499
    2) $500–$999
    3) $1,000–$2,000
    4) above $2,000 (specify _____)

16. Presently receiving primary support for education from: (indicate percentage)
    0) own income _____
    1) parents _____
    2) loans _____
    3) federal grants _____
    4) state grants _____
    5) institutional scholarships _____
    6) work-study program _____
    7) other (specify _____) _____

17. Self-described political leaning
    0) strong or moderate conservative
    1) middle-of-the-road
    2) liberal
    3) left

Review of Student Response

Deadline October 5, 1973

PLEASE NOTE:

Postsecondary education is any formal instruction, research or public service after the 12th grade, to include higher education, junior colleges, business, vocational, and technical schools.

The italicized question in each category is an explanation of each category.

Fill in the corresponding square on the IBM answer sheet. Be sure to use a No. 2 lead pencil. Please return both the survey and the answer sheet.

DIVERSITY AND FLEXIBILITY

18. *Postsecondary education should offer programs with sufficient flexibility to accommodate the changing needs of individuals and society.*
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

19. The present curriculums should be designed to make the graduate more employable.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

20. Postsecondary education is presently flexible and responsive to individual needs.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

21. Institutions should keep program offerings up to date.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

22. Institutions should keep program offerings up to date even if it means higher tuition.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

23. On-the-job training or internship programs make education more valuable.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

24. Present internship programs are adequate.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

25. Programs should be structured to meet specific manpower requirements of society.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

26. Programs should be structured with the flexibility to "drop-in" and "drop-out."
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

EXCELLENCE IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

27. *Postsecondary education should strive for excellence in all instruction, research, public service and other learning opportunities.*
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

INSTITUTIONAL INDEPENDENCE

28. *Institutions of postsecondary education should have sufficient freedom and flexibility to maintain institutional and professional integrity and to meet, creatively and responsibly, their educational goals.*
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

29. Federal money means federal control.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

30. Institutions should accept federal support for diversity and flexibility of program offerings even if it means a loss of some independence
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

INSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

31. *Institutions of postsecondary education should use fiscal and other resources both efficiently and effectively and employ procedures sufficient to enable funders to determine whether resources are achieving desired outcomes.*
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

32. Institutions are presently using financial resources efficiently and effectively.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

33. Tuition costs should be standardized throughout the country.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

STUDENT RESPONSIBILITY

34. *Students should be responsible in maintaining progress toward a specific academic goal.*
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

35. Students should have to maintain a minimum grade point average.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

36. Students are more responsible for their education if they pay some of the costs.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

37. Students should be more active in support of their institution.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

38. If students fail to find employment after graduation, they would be justified in applying for suspension or cancellation of any educational loans.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

ACCESS TO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

39. *Each individual should be able to enroll in some form of postsecondary education appropriate to that person's needs, capability and motivation.*
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

40. Postsecondary education should include those students who do not have the ability to pay.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

41. Student aid should be determined by financial need rather than academic ability.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

CHOICE OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

42. *Each individual should have a reasonable choice among those institutions of postsecondary education that have accepted him for admission.*
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

43. Students should be able to select any form of public or private postsecondary education for which they are qualified regardless of cost.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

44. Once students are admitted, they should be given an unrestricted choice of program offerings.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

OPPORTUNITY, ONCE ENROLLED IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

45. *Postsecondary education should make available academic assistance and counseling that will enable each individual, according to his needs, capability and motivation to achieve his educational objectives.*
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

46. If a student has academic deficiencies, programs should be provided to compensate for them.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

47. Institutions should insure that students complete a program once they are accepted.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

48. Students should receive public funds to attend some form of postsecondary education even if they do not intend to complete the program.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

49. High school counseling offers adequate knowledge of educational opportunities.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

50. High school counseling offers adequate knowledge of employment opportunities.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

51. High school education offers adequate preparation for postsecondary education.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

ADEQUACY OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES

52. *Adequate financial and other resources should be made available to permit the accomplishment of the objectives of diversity and flexibility, excellence, institutional independence, institutional accountability, access, choice and opportunity.*
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

53. The present funding structure is adequate.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

54. Present financial aid programs are difficult to understand and the application process is complicated.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

55. Postsecondary education faces a financial crisis.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

RESPONSIBILITY FOR FINANCING POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

56. *The responsibility for financing postsecondary education should be shared by a combination of public and private sources, including federal, state, and local government, and by students, parents and other concerned individuals and organizations.*
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

57. Parents should be considered as a source of financing postsecondary education.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

58. If parents contributed to postsecondary education, it would be difficult to be independent.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

59. Student loans would be preferable to parental contributions.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

60. Loan repayment is an unfair burden on student income after graduation.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

61. Students should pay a share of the cost of their education.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

62. The federal government should help finance postsecondary education.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

63. Postsecondary education should derive its <u>primary</u> financial support from:
0) parents 1) students 2) federal gov't 3) state gov't 4) local gov't

STUDENT STATUS

64. *Students should be recognized as legal adults and receive all the rights accorded that status.*
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

65. Postsecondary education is designed to produce quantity not quality.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

66. Students should hold institutions responsible for their actions.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

67. Students have an obligation to attempt to reform postsecondary institutions.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

INSTITUTIONAL ROLE

68. *Research, public service and other functions are appropriate only when they are compatible with and encourage instructional quality.*
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

69. Educational institutions should remain the primary research centers in the U.S.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

PERSONAL RESPONSE

70. *What is your overall evaluation of your institution?*
0) very satisfied 1) satisfied 2) dissatisfied 3) very dissatisfied

71. I would rather be going to school now than doing anything else.
0) strongly agree 1) agree 2) disagree 3) strongly disagree

72. Geographic proximity was a major consideration in the choice of my present institution.
0) essential 1) fairly important 2) not important

Rank the following in order of personal preference.
Fill in blanks with the numbers 1-9, use each number only once.
Transfer rankings to appropriate square on answer sheet.

73. ____diversity-flexibility of program offerings

74. ____equal access for all those who desire postsecondary education

75. ____opportunity-academic assistance, remedial, tutorial services

76. ____accountability-efficiency and effectiveness of institution

77. ____student responsibility

78. ____instructional quality

79. ____independence of institution

80. ____student choice among program and institutional type

81. ____support-help in paying cost of education

Rank the following in order of personal preference.
Fill in blanks with the numbers 1-3, use each number only once.
Transfer rankings to appropriate square on answer sheet.

82. ____student choice among program and institutional type

83. ____opportunity-academic assistance, remedial, tutorial services

84. ____equal access for all those who desire postsecondary education

---

Fill in blanks with the numbers 1-7, use each number only once.
Transfer rankings to appropriate square on answer sheet.

I am participating in postsecondary education for: (rank)

85. ____employability

86. ____income

87. ____general skill development

88. ____citizenship

89. ____sociability

90. ____self-development

91. ____transmission of values

IMMEDIATE RETURN IS ESSENTIAL!

Use self-addressed envelope to remit both survey and (unfolded) answer sheet to:

National Commission on the Financing of
Postsecondary Education
1612 Court Place, Suite 750
Denver, Colorado 80202

Appendix III-2-A

Albertus Magnus College
Arkansas College
Assumption College
Baltimore College of Com
Bay De Noc Community College
Belleville Area College
Bennington College
Black Hills State
Bridgewater College
Brigham Young University
Burlington County College
Cal State U-Fresno
Cal State U-Humboldt
Cal State U-Long Beach
Central Arizona College
Central State University
Clarkson College of Tech
Cleveland State University
College of the Canyons
City College-Chicago Amnd
Med-Dent of NJ-Newark
College of San Mateo
Columbia St Cmty College
Colo Mtn College-West Campus
Columbia Junior College
C C Allegheny Co
Cooper Union
Cornell U-Main Campus
Craven Tech Inst
Cuyahoga CC-West Campus
Dean Junior College
Detroit College of Bus
Detroit College of Law
Dominican C of San Rafael
Drexel University
East Texas Bapt College
Eastern Montana College
Eastern NM U-Roswell Cam
Essex Community College
Evangel College
Federal City College
Felican College
Fla Agricultural-Mech U
Franklin University
Freed-Hardman College
Garland Junior College
George Fox College
Gloucester County College
Graceland College
Graduate Theol Union
Greenville College
Greenville Tech Ed Center
Grossmont College
Harford Community College
Haverford College
Hebrew Union C Cal Branch
Hibbing St Junior College
Hiibert College
Illinois State University
Iowa Lakes CC-South Campus

Indiana Central College
Jefferson College
Johnson-Wales College
John F Kennedy College
Kenyon College
Lebanon Vlly College
Lewis-Clark St College
Lincoln Technical College
Livingston University
Longwood College
Lola College
Long Is U-Brooklyn Center
Lorain Cty Cmty College
Malone College
Mars Hill College
Marywood College
Marymount College
Marrymount Manhattan
Mass Bay Cmty College
Medical College of Wis
Memphis State U
Merrimack College
Middlesex Cmty College
Midwestern Bapt Theol Sem
Miss Valley State College
Moorhead State College
Morgan Co Cmty College
Mount Saint Mary College
Mo Bapt C Hannibl-Lagrnge
Nebraska Western College
Newarl College of Eng
New England College
New River Cmty College
Northern Ky State College
Northern Va Cmty College
Wm Mitchell College of Law
Oakland CC-Auburn Hills
Oregon Tech Inst
Palo Verde College
Pa State U-Schuylkill
Pierce Junior College
Post Junior College
Quinebaug Callet CC
Richard Bland C Wm-My
Rosary Hill College
Saint Cloud State College
Saint Paul Bible College
Saint Xavier College
Scottsdale Cmty College
Southern Bapt Theol Sem
Southwestern CC-Keokuk
Southern W Va CC-Logan
Spring Arbor College
Southeastern Bible College
Sthn Missionary College
SUNY C Herkmer-Rome-Utica
Tacoma Cmty College
Tarrant Co JC
Templer U-Ambler Campus
Tri-County Tech Inst
Trinity Christian College
Trinity College
Union College-Ky
Union College-NY

U Cal San Frisco Medl Sch
U of Pittsburgh-Titusvl
U of Tenn at Chattanooga
University of Tulsa
U of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
U of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
Va Poly Inst and State U
Va Western Cmty College
Victor Calley College
Walters St Cmty College
Washington State U
Westworth Inst
Wesley College
Western College
West Liberty St College
Wharton Co Jr College
Whitworth College
Wiley College
Wilmington College
Wood Junior College

Appendix III-2-B

Survey Population

Four-Year Institutions

Enrollment	Total 4-Yr. Population	Number Institutions	% of 4-Year Population	% of Total Student Population	No. of Surveys to Each Group	Sample Population
Less than 500	101,078	428	1.6	1.1	110	5,500
500 – 999	266,682	365	4.3	3.0	300	15,000
1,000 – 1,999	512,740	366	8.2	5.8	580	29,000
2,000 – 4,999	898,920	287	14.4	10.1	1,010	50,500
5,000 – 9,999	1,258,942	175	20.2	14.2	1,420	71,000
10,000 – 25,000	2,205,276	142	35.4	24.9	2,490	124,500
More than 25,000	993,053	31	15.9	11.2	1,120	56,000
	6,236,691	1,794			7,030	351,500

Two-Year Institutions

Enrollment	National Student Population	Number Institutions	% of 2-Year Population	% of Total Student Population	No. of Surveys to Each Group	Sample Population
Less than 500	78,002	281	3.0	.9	90	4,500
500 – 999	170,362	237	6.5	1.9	190	9,500
1,000 – 1,999	312,977	229	11.9	3.5	350	17,500
2,000 – 4,999	653,906	204	24.8	7.4	740	37,000
5,000 – 9,999	681,729	102	25.9	7.7	770	38,500
10,000 – 25,000	680,620	49	25.8	7.7	770	38,500
More than 25,000	57,678	2	2.3	.7	70	3,500
	2,635,274	1,105			2,980	149,000

Appendix III-3-A

Sample Printout
Survey of Student Response*

TABLES

FILE IS NEWFILE

QUESTION 31 BY MOTHER.ED

CELL CONTENTS ARE. . . .
CELL COUNT
ROW PERCENT
CUMULATIVE ROW PERCENT
COLUMN PERCENT
CUMULATIVE COL PERCENT
PERCENT OF TOTAL N

		MOTHER.ED				
QUESTION 31		0	1	2	3	ROW TOTALS
	0	4	8	5	3	20
		20.0	40.0	25.0	15.0	100.0
		20.0	60.0	85.0	100.0	100.0
		44.4	44.4	38.5	37.5	41.7
		44.4	44.4	38.5	37.5	41.7
		8.3	16.7	10.4	6.3	41.7
	1	3	8	8	5	24
		12.5	33.3	33.3	20.8	100.0
		12.5	45.8	79.2	100.0	100.0
		33.3	44.4	61.5	62.5	50.0
		77.8	88.9	100.0	100.0	91.7
		6.3	16.7	16.7	10.4	50.0
	2	2	2			4
		50.0	50.0			100.0
		50.0	100.0			100.0
		22.2	11.1			8.3
		100.0	100.0			100.3
		4.2	4.2			8.3
TOTAL N		9	18	13	8	48
ROW PCT		18.8	37.5	27.1	16.7	100.0
CUM ROW		18.8	56.3	83.3	100.0	100.0
COL PCT		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
CUM COL		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*This printout was initially run to test programs. The results of this page are inaccurate and do not represent totals.

Appendix III-3-B

CHI SQUARE
    WORST EXPECTED VALUE
    D.F.
CRAMER'S V
CONTINGENCY COEFFICIENT
T
LAMBDA SYMMETRIC
LAMBDA PREDICTING ROWS
LAMBDA PREDICTING COLUMNS
TAU-B
TAU-C
GAMMA
SOMER'S D PREDICTING ROWS
SOMER'S D PREDICTING COLUMNS
SOMER'S D SYMMETRIC
KENDALL'S S
CORRELATION
ETA (ROWS)
ETA (COLUMNS)

Appendix III-3-C

Cross Tabulations

Question	Cross-tab
18.	11, 65, 94
19.	5, 6, 11, 65, 94
20.	
21.	11
22.	11
23.	11, 94
24.	11, 94
25.	1, 11
26.	11
27.	10, 13, 65, 94
28.	13, 92, 94
29.	13, 92, 94
30.	13, 92, 94
31.	15, 16
32.	15, 16
33.	15, 16
34.	11, 15, 16, 94
35.	11, 15, 16, 94
36.	11, 15, 16, 94
37.	11, 15, 16, 94
38.	11, 15, 16, 94
39.	2, 4, 7, 10, 13, 14, 42, 65, 94
40.	2, 4, 7, 10, 13, 94
41.	2, 4, 7, 10, 13, 94
42.	15, 16, 39
43.	15, 16
44.	15, 16
45.	8, 9, 10, 11
46.	8, 9, 10, 11
47.	8, 9, 10, 11
48.	8, 9, 10, 11
49.	8, 9, 10, 11, 12
50.	8, 9, 10, 11, 12
51.	8, 9, 10, 11, 12
52.	4, 7, 15, 16
53	4, 7, 15, 16, 55, 63
54.	4, 7, 15, 16
55.	4, 7, 15, 16, 53
56.	4, 7, 15, 16
57.	4, 5, 6, 7, 15, 16
58.	4, 7, 15, 16, 59
59.	4, 7, 15, 16, 58
60.	4, 7, 15, 16, 61
61.	4, 7, 15, 16, 60
62.	4, 7, 15, 16, 63
63.	4, 7, 15, 16, 53, 62

64.	11, 13, 15
65.	11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19, 27, 39, 93, 94
66.	11, 13, 15
67.	11, 13, 15, 70
68.	11, 94
69.	11, 94
70.	9, 10, 11, 67, 71, 92, 93, 94
71.	9, 10, 11, 17, 92, 93, 94
72.	9, 10, 11, 92, 93, 94